# *The* Perkins School *of* Theology JOURNAL

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

SYMPOSIUM:

CHRISTIANITY AND RACE

BOOK REVIEWS

SUMMER SCHOOL 1958

SPRING NUMBER: 1958

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas

THE PERKINS SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY JOURNAL

"Let us unite the two so long divided — knowledge and vital piety." — John Wesley

Volume XI SPRING NUMBER 1958 Numbers 2-3

CONTENTS

"WHO CAN BUT PROPHESY?" ..... 3

SYMPOSIUM: CHRISTIANITY AND RACE

PART I: FOUNDATIONS IN CHRISTIAN ETHICAL THINKING

I. Segregation and the Minister's Faith ..... *John Deschner* 4

II. Judgment and Redemption in Race Relations ..... *Joseph L. Allen* 9

PART II: THE PROBLEM OF RACE

I. The Scientific Understanding of Race ..... *Douglas Jackson* 14

II. The Role of the Supreme Court ..... *Arthur L. Harding* 18

III. The Southern Temper ..... *Merrimon Cuninggim* 23

IV. The Role of the American Churches ..... *R. F. Curl* 29

V. The Churches Speak ..... *Allen Lamar Cooper* 35

VI. Race and the World Mission of the Church ..... *Alfred W. Wasson* 43

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 49

SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAMS 1958 ..... (Back Cover)

---

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor ..... Howard Grimes
(On leave 1957-58)

Editor pro tempore ..... H. Neill McFarland

Book Review Editor ..... Fred D. Gealy

Faculty Committee on Publications:

Chairman ..... Herndon Wagers

Members: *Joseph L. Allen, John W. Deschner,*
*W. Richey Hogg, Kermit Schoonover*

The Perkins School of Theology JOURNAL is edited for the alumni of the school and for the Methodist ministers of the South Central Jurisdiction. The Publications Committee of the School of Theology is in charge of the project.

The JOURNAL is published three times a year by the Perkins School of Theology, and is printed at Southern Methodist University.

Perkins School of Theology
Southern Methodist University Dallas 5, Texas

# "WHO CAN BUT PROPHESY?"

This special issue of the *Journal* reflects the compulsion of a collective conscience. It is sent forth by a community of scholars and teachers, to whom, in part, the Church has committed the task of interpreting the relevance of the historic Gospel to the crises of the present age. In a sense, therefore, it may be said that this issue of the *Journal* had to be. To be sure, in the details of its composition, it is the product of many arbitrary decisions. In these matters, nothing is foreordained. Still, the publication at this time of an issue given over to the consideration of this vexed topic really is not completely optional with us—it is to a considerable extent imperative. "The lion has roared; who will not fear? The Lord God has spoken; who can but prophesy?" (Amos 3:8).

Even so, while we feel that we are duty-bound and conscience-driven to speak, we are aware that we do not speak with all wisdom. What we say here we say with humility. If there is within any one of us, in his approach to the subject of race relations, a tendency to judge others, we hope that it is not conveyed in these printed words. If there is among our readers one who resents all challenges to traditional modes of thinking and behavior in race relations, we hope that these statements will not precipitate irrational outbursts on his part. Such results are not intended. All that is set forth in the publication is the product of serious, labored study and painful self-searching, prayerfully pursued. We have endeavored to face each issue honestly and to discourse upon it calmly. No one of us claims infallibility for his conclusions; but together we are prepared to urge that it is as a result of discussions and inner struggles of this order that the mind of God is likely to find expression in the words and deeds of His people.

The contributors to this issue are, with two exceptions, active members of the Perkins faculty: Dr. A. W. Wasson is retired and Dr. Arthur L. Harding is a professor in the School of Law. With only one exception, the authors are Southern-born, and all are Southern-bred. Each one, therefore, brings to his present task a knowledge of and devotion to the finest traditions of the South and Southwest. In examining the problem of race in the light of Christian ethical principles, each man is concerned not to disrupt the society which has sustained him, but rather to safeguard that society from the ruin which now is imminent if prejudice is not checked. How shall prejudice be countered effectively if not by a resurgence of Christian faith and its fruits? The central figure in this crisis—the one to whom in particular this issue of the *Journal* is addressed—is the Christian pastor. We believe that faith is the answer, and "faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ" (Romans 10:17).

H. Neill McFarland

# *Symposium:* CHRISTIANITY AND RACE

## PART I. FOUNDATIONS IN CHRISTIAN ETHICAL THINKING

### I. Segregation and the Minister's Faith

*By* JOHN DESCHNER

Whether he seeks it or not, the key role in the desegregation crisis is falling to the Southern minister. Among Negroes the representative leader has long been the minister. And it may yet prove true that the crisis of the South will focus upon the heart of his white fellow-pastor. In that heart there is a tragic division: a division between his moral conviction and his pastoral responsibility. The white Southern pastor wants help in understanding this dilemma.

The *help* he gets is not always very helpful. He is being confronted with reiterated statements of what most pastors believe already: that segregation is wrong. But that only sharpens his dilemma. Racial justice seems to war against the unity and effectiveness of his congregation. It is not more moral exhortation which he wants and needs; he wants and needs a way of understanding his moral obligation on race concretely in a community where he has responsibility for the Church's mission.

He feels he must speak, but he fails to speak. The dilemma is silencing him. He is painfully aware of "the growing gap between pew and pulpit" on the race issue. He knows the agony of this "period of the great silence," when "the days are too evil for a sound to be uttered."[1] In some cases it may be fear or cowardice: all of us know something of that. But in most cases it is silence because he wants to be constructive, because he senses the consequences, because he believes his first responsibility is to the Church's mission, and this race problem somehow seems to come as a great interruption and disruption of that. It is this divided heart which silences his tongue. And that heart needs to be examined.

There is a way to integrity and witness in this matter for the pastor, *if* the race question is not an expendable moral issue, but a matter of the Gospel, a fundamental question about the character of that Church he feels responsible to serve. But *is* the race question such a matter of the Gospel? Or is it simply a moral question, a matter of "applying" the Gospel? This question calls for serious and fresh thinking.

#### II

The theological discussion of race in this country is remarkable for its underemphasis of precisely this evangelical relationship. Generally speaking, the issues discussed and the positions taken are those developed a generation or more ago in another social, theological, and Church situation. In brief review, it seems to me that three principal issues are being touched.

1. *The Biblical teaching*: It is hardly fair to call the exegetical discussion a real debate. By use of loose exegesis, segregationists make a show of Biblical authority for their position, but more responsible exegetes are

[1] *Christianity and Crisis*, March 3, 1958, p. 25.

answering them decisively, verse by verse, and showing that the honest conservative will have to take seriously "that the Bible is utterly indifferent to variations of skin color."[2]

It was not God but Noah who cursed Ham, and on the morning after his big drunk! Not to mention that there is no shred of exegetical evidence that Negroes are descended from Ham. Segregationists have tried to find reference to divine boundaries for the races in Acts 17:26, the very verse which speaks of God having "made of one blood all nations of men!" Yet again, the laws preserving the purity of Israel are translated into sanctions for preserving the purity of races. But Jewish writers themselves refuse to interpret these as laws of *racial* purity. These laws maintain the *religious* purity of a people always open, in principle, to proselytes from other nations.[3]

The significant fact about the Biblical discussion is that segregationists have yet to show a responsible Biblical exegesis which can lend any support at all to their position. The more theologically acute among them will not try to ground the case here very directly. They are much more likely to lead the discussion to Genesis 1 and evolution, with the intention of showing that God intended things to stay the way He created them. But that leads to the second area of discussion.

2. *God's intention in creation*: Here what debate there is rages. Both sides claim the authority of God's created order. God made them white and black and He intends them to stay that way, says one side, taking pains to show that the anthropologist, with his doubts about separate origins of races, is silenced by the presumably more authoritative scientific account in Genesis. God made only one race, the human race, and man himself has divided it on the basis of color, says the other side,[4] pointing out that the created equality of men underlies our democratic way of life.

This appeal to created order is an ancient tradition in Christian ethics. But this situation where both sides are appealing to it clearly shows how dangerous this appeal can be when it is made apart from God's sight-restoring grace. Obviously someone is not seeing the order God created. Our Bibles tell us that man is sinfully determined *not* to see the glory of God's creation (Rom. 1-18 f.). And the Church warns against trying to read natural law apart from revelation. The decisive key to the character of God's created order is God's revelation in Jesus Christ—His work and words and life, and especially His reconstitution of humanity in the Church. This is why the key to understanding the race problem is not so much our theory of creation as the reality of the Church. There, in the light of the New Creation we can see what the original creation really was and is.

3. *The Kingdom of God*: Dr. E. Earle Ellis, in the most serious recent theological attack upon integration,[5] makes the crucial issue to be whether the Kingdom of God challenges and alters this world's "customs." The New Testament Church, he notes, presents not a uniformity, but a unity in diversity. "And the Kingdom in the Church does not negate the Church's relation to the social customs of the world and of the Churches." "If the Kingdom of God is seen as intersecting—and yet above—a this-world framework, compatible with—and yet superseding—the many and varied distinc-

---

[2] Ben Lacy Rose, *Racial Segregation in the Church*, p. 27.

[3] Cf. Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, "The Bible Speaks on Segregation," *Christian Friends Bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League*, April 1957, pp. 5-6.

[4] Cf. "Protestantism Speaks on Justice and Integration," *The Christian Century*, Feb. 5, 1958, especially the National Baptist and United Presbyterian statements on p. 165.

[5] E. Earle Ellis, "Segregation and the Kingdom of God," *Christianity Today*, March 18, 1957, pp. 6-9.

tions in this present age, then segregation is, in principle, an equally valid answer."

We can hope and pray with Ellis that there will be much good and interesting diversity in God's Kingdom! The Kingdom is not only compatible with the diversity of mankind: it has a transforming place for the full meaning of this diversity. But segregation is not simply the public recognition of God-given differences. Segregation is the exploitation of those differences. Segregation is seizing upon visible differences to justify our sin against our brother. Segregation is precisely the refusal to permit the human family to use and enjoy and respect the gifts which God has given to each of the "races." Segregation is sin. Not the differences as such, but man's sinful exploitation of differences is the issue in segregation; and the Kingdom which is good news to the poor, proclaims release to the captives, sets at liberty those who are oppressed is not compatible with man's sin. Here the Gospel does not conform to our thinking about race, but transforms it (Rom. 12:2). In the mouth of Jesus and the early Church, the Kingdom message was not followed with orders about compatibility, but with words about repentance!

III

The clarifying perspective for the race question today is not so much that of creation or eschatology, but rather that of the doctrine of the Church. The Methodist decision about the Central Jurisdiction faces race as a question about the Church. In this seemingly technical step there are seeds for a theological revolution in our not exactly fresh thinking about race. It is a revolution which suggests an answer to the minister's dilemma about segregation. The following is an attempt to say something of how the race problem looks when viewed as a question about the Church.

The New Testament is extremely sensitive to any temptation to register human distinctions in the new Community of God. The Epistle of James attacks sharply any attempt to let wealth determine who shall be honored in the Church (Ja. 1:9-10, 2:1-6). Peter finds the power of the Holy Spirit breaking down any opinions he may have had about admitting Gentiles (the unreligious!) into the Church (Acts 10:34-35). The Pauline tradition is clear that "here there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free man, but Christ is all, and in all" (Col. 3:11; cf. Gal. 3:28). Precisely where differences in secular status are acknowledged, as in the case of Onesimus, the slaveowner is exhorted to receive the slave again into his service, and now obviously also into "the Church in your house," "no longer as a slave but more than a slave, as a beloved brother" (Philem. 2, 16). Paul's great struggle against the Judaizers is in part a struggle against segregation in the Church (cf. Gal. 2:11 ff). What is being said here? Obviously that wealth, nationality, religion, social status, vocation, cultural level (the "Scythian" was a nomadic barbarian famed for his savagery!), even sex—in short, the gamut of human distinctions—shall not divide the Church, and indeed in all these cases the *local congregation* of God.

Why? Why is the principle of inclusiveness so critical for the New Testament Church? The answer is suggested in Ephesians 2:11-22. It is a surprising answer. It addresses *us* as the outsiders! *We* were those who were separated from God, who had no place in God's chosen commonwealth of Israel, who were strangers to God's covenant, who were hopeless and godless. If we now know God, and have a place in Israel and her covenant, and live in hope, it is because God, in sheer grace, broke down the dividing walls between the Jew and us (v. 14), and gave us a place in His Community. But we must never forget that we belong in the Church as guests. We are not

the ultimate policy-makers and rule-drafters in this Community! We are not even charter members of it. We are wild branches grafted in (Rom. 10:17). Every Christian stands in the place which rightfully belongs to a Jew, and this by the grace of God who paid the ultimate price that we might have this privilege. It is the privilege not to set ourselves off from others, but to be the servant of all others. Israel's mission, Old and New, is to be God's "suffering servant" for all the peoples (Isa. 53).

What does this mean? It means that a local congregation is not an association of those Christians who happen to like each other, and who can therefore set their own exclusive rules for admission. When that happens, that congregation has not simply omitted a moral implication of the Gospel; it has allowed a fundamental question to arise as to whether it belongs to the Church of Jesus Christ. It is no good trying to solve the race question by asking where people "feel at home." The Church is not our club; it is God's holy instrument, in which we have been permitted a place—but a place which has room only for God's task, and no room for our conditions and preferences. He created this People. He set its task: to bear witness to the good news of reconciliation. He set the essential rule: that not only this People's word but its very existence should shine like a light in the world (Matt. 5:14 f.).

Right here it becomes clear that by facing race as a question about the Church we have not narrowed but broadened our thinking, and in the most radical way. For the Church does not exist for herself: she exists for all the rest. Her message and reconciled reality are the one piece of good news relevant to all mankind. The Church is never simply one segment of society, as if to speak of her meant forgetting all the rest. The Church is the germ, the provisional showing-forth, of God's ultimate intention for every segment of society. The Church is the pointing sign here and now to the kind of human community God created and intends to have again—or else it is a traitor Church, a useless Church, a parasite branch which God can well enough break off (Rom. 11:21). The Church's fundamental task is to point to—to proclaim—the Kingdom.

But the Kingdom of God which we proclaim is much vaster than the Church. In the New Testament the Kingdom is not built by simple enlargement of the Church. The Kingdom is not really built at all: it "comes, where and when the Lord comes." It has already come among us in Christ's Lordship, and it comes to meet us in the great fulfillment which we await for all human society, secular and Christian. The important point for us is that here and now the Lord of this Kingdom is already at work, both in us and also far afield of the Church, creating those honorable and glorious things in the here and now which shall ultimately be brought into His Kingdom (Rev. 21:24-27). The Kingdom is already provisionally among us, and provisionally stirring in the whole world. And God gives His Church eyes to see these signs of the Kingdom's coming—both the signs of the Spirit's work in the Church, and the "signs of the times" (Matt. 16:3) in the world itself. When we see these signs we can gladly recognize them as signs God has worked, as signs which therefore have a hidden affinity to the sign of the Church, as signs which we are to point to and stand for as confirmations that God has indeed not left us to ourselves, but has drawn near to judge and save us and reconcile us to Himself and to each other.

The rise of the Negro in our decades is surely such a sign; a sign full of both judgment and mercy. Here is a sign that God will not leave His people in bondage and suffering, nor without the grace of His judgment.

We should long ago have removed the

scandal and shame that God's People, the Church, is not willing to show the world the reconciliation she proclaims. What can it mean that we send out missionaries when their converts would often be unwelcome in our sending Churches? Let us be ashamed of our lack of faith as a Church, and ask God for a faith which obeys. But our shame is no excuse for failing to see the "signs of the times" in society around us. We are Christianly blind if we think that the prime mover in the rise of the Negro is simply the NAACP, just as we are Christianly blind if we do not see that our abuse of the NAACP falls also, and mainly, upon another Head. Because the Lord is at work in it, we Christians have good reason to stand by such an event as the Supreme Court decision, not simply saying our yes or no to it, but bearing witness to what it signifies, that God intends for mankind a Community where men shall respect each other.

The race issue, I am suggesting, is best approached as a question about the nature of the Church.[6] If the Church is simply an association of individuals who have accepted an individual Gospel, then a segregated Church is possible, and even inevitable. In such a Church "responsible" silence about the matter in the pulpit is at least thinkable. But that is not the Church! The Church of Jesus Christ in all its inclusiveness is part of the Gospel, not an incidental implication of it. If the Church is God's New Israel in which we are all guests, if we occupy our place in this suffering, witnessing people by God's grace, if our task is to be the provisional form of God's ultimate human Community and to point out to every man the signs of its coming, if this is what the Church is, then a segregated Church is not only a shameful denial of the Gospel, but a betrayal of the nation as well.

The race question boils down to an issue of faith: is the Church part of the Gospel?

IV

Let us return to the minister's dilemma. Is it not the case that the dilemma exists in part because the minister is torn between what he considers to be a moral conviction and his religious vocation? He sees the Gospel on the one hand and somehow feels that, although he is convinced of the wrongness of segregation, he is not perfectly free out of loyalty to his Church, to apply the Gospel in this case.

But if our picture of the race question has been true, then this dilemma is false. The race question is not such a dispensable moral question. It is rather a fundamental question about the inclusiveness of the Church *to which the pastor feels responsible.* Christianity is not being asked, first of all, whether it is willing to "apply" the Gospel, but *which* Gospel it believes and lives by. The minister is not being asked to choose between conviction and responsibility, but *which* Church he is going to be responsible to. In this sense, the race question is a question about the minister's own faith.

Stated another way: it is elementary and fundamental that our faith and our responsibility are deeply one. When faith demands one thing and responsibility another, one of them is not Christian. When one's sense of responsibility leads him to silence the Gospel, something is not right with both that sense of responsibility and that Gospel.

[6] The Roman Catholics certainly sense this, and many of their statements go beyond natural law to redemption and the Church for their ground. The Roman doctrine of the Church underlies a marvelous statement like this from Archbishop Lucey of San Antonio: "The sin of segregation hurts the white man's conscience because he remembers that what you do to the least of the brethren you do to Christ; and the idea of a segregated Christ seems like a blasphemy to him. Is it not Catholic doctrine that when a brother is excluded, rejected, segregated, it is Christ who is insulted and humiliated?" "The Church and Synagogue Speak," *Christian Friends Bulletin of the Anti-Defamation League,* April, 1957, p. 9. Cf. also the statements there by Pope Pius XII and Archbishop Rummel of New Orleans.

Could it be that the sense of responsibility weighs so much because we are not willing to let Christ bear it? Is it even possible that this responsibility—the responsibility for the unity and effectiveness of our congregations—is not primarily our responsibility at all, but primarily His responsibility? Christ makes His people one—yesterday and today! The responsibility is His: He longs for His Church to give up trying to hold His Church together for Him.

And He has his own way of bringing peace and concord. Christian peace is not the absence of conflict, but health, soundness, just peace. The "peace" we can create with our tact and silence is false peace. To it Christ, in the name of peace, must bring a sword (Luke 12:51 f.). Only Christ gives real peace to His people, and not as the world gives (John 15:27).

Christ gives this peace through the preaching of the Gospel. True peace can be withheld only from a congregation in which the whole Gospel is not preached. *In the Church of Jesus Christ, a minister can do no greater and more responsible service to his people, and indeed to their unity and mutual love, than to let the Gospel be free to speak in his pulpit.* The minister's own task is preaching; clear preaching is what the South most needs. This does not mean forcing the issue into the pulpit, or preaching merely one's opinions on race; it means allowing the Gospel of God's inclusive reconciliation the freedom of the pulpit. Of all the freedoms we cherish so much, there is none greater than this: the freedom of the Gospel to be the Gospel in its own pulpit. This freedom will bring Christ's own peace to His congregations.

The race question challenges the Church not to enter a moral crusade, but to be the Church, not to do something extra, but to do the one thing essential. And it challenges the minister to be a man of faith. The race question does not draw us away from Christ. The reverse is true: there is no other point where the Church can approach so near to Christ—no sermon, or sacrament, or evangelistic effort. Or rather, there is no point where Christ has come closer to the churches than in the Negro brother.

In God's grace, this question will yet purify and unify His Church.

## II. Judgment and Redemption in Race Relations

*By* Joseph L. Allen

The first step toward any solution of racial tensions is to ask, "What is going on?" The interpretations people have of the problem, what they think is happening, significantly influence the way they act. If they are convinced, for example, that what is going on in race relations is a gigantic conspiracy to destroy society, then they will understandably respond with an all-encompassing distrust and a paranoid fear. They will embark on a mad search for "the enemy" and, having chosen one, seek to annihilate him. To move to another extreme, if people are convinced that *nothing* significant is going on in the South's present racial tensions, they will likely disregard the problem and any possible solutions until pressures produce an explosion. Our interpretation of events goes a long way toward determining our actions.

The insights of Christian faith will lead a person to see some meanings in human events which non-Christians will not admit. Christians need to protest any view of the race problem as simply a matter of education, or as merely one's private business, or as an arena in which only man acts. First and foremost, God is acting, to judge and to redeem, in our race relations. We hesitate to admit this, perhaps because of the

realization that in this problem we have not acted as His obedient servants. It is more comfortable to close the door on our racial injustices and not admit that we act in the presence of God. Indeed, the main distortion in our interpretation of the race problem may lie in our attempt to see our neighbor's action apart from an understanding of what God is doing. An inadequate interpretation of God's action lies at the base of misinterpretations and distorted responses to the race problem.

Christians are compelled by their faith to ask what God is doing in their lives. This inquiry is a necessary preface to the question, "What should I do?" We shall speak here of God's action in judgment and redemption, as it undergirds any adequate response to the race problem.[1]

### *God's Judging Action in History*

When men look at events around them, they observe that in some way judgment comes upon human actions. This judgment does not wait for the end of the drama. Before our very eyes some people and nations seem to call down wrath on their own heads. Adolf Hitler's suicide in the bunker in Berlin does not seem entirely out of place after his destruction of Europe or after the mass murders of Dachau and Buchenwald. It does not appear inappropriate that Mussolini, after his crushing of Ethiopia and the ensuing tragedies, should later hang in the streets of Milan, killed by those he led to national ruin. In some form and by some logic, judgment comes within the events of this world. Christians cannot identify the judgments they see within the world's events with final judgment; we do not claim that the only way God's judgment comes is through His use of the forces of society. But use them He does, to express within the processes of history His wrath on man's sin.

People who are deeply involved in the race problem, as are all of us in the South, find it extremely difficult to say how, where, and when this judgment comes. It is easy to see judgment coming on another person or group; it is correspondingly hard to admit how judgment may come upon oneself. It takes no great moral strength for people in other regions to declare that the tensions and disruptions in the South today are judgment for an unwillingness to change unjust social patterns and to practice brotherhood. However true this statement is, it is presumptuous to announce with assurance the sin of another. To such accusations Southerners readily reply that other areas also have prejudice and race problems; and they point to judgment in the form of race riots and strains among national groups. It is quite true that race is a problem throughout the nation and the world, not only in the South. Even so this reply also is presumptuous. It focuses on the sin of another. Our need is to see how our own lives are under judgment, not to defend ourselves by accusing somebody else.

We may also try to avoid a sense of God's judgment by attributing our woes to an unjust Fate. By this view our problems are somebody else's fault. Southerners can point to the fact that others brought the Negro to these shores. They may try to argue that the Negro's position was made necessary by the region's rural economy. They often protest that the South was moving toward greater racial justice when the Supreme Court decision of 1954 complicated the problem. Or perhaps our troubles are the fault of other groups within the South. Middle and upper class Southerners may blame racial tensions on the prejudices of lower class whites. White workers may feel, on the contrary, that wealthier Southern citizens have deserted

[1] For an illuminating interpretation of race relations from a similar standpoint, see Waldo Beach, "A Theological Analysis of Race Relations," *Faith and Ethics: The Theology of H. Richard Niebuhr*, ed. Paul Ramsey (New York: Harpers, 1957), pp. 205-224.

them in the face of increasing pressures for desegregation. By all these interpretations the South's racial problems are blamed on someone else. With this view one does not look within himself to find the cause of his trouble.

This attitude itself is a way of asking for further judgment. If our troubles come only from the sins of others, then the next step is to see ourselves as righteous. We begin to defend our customs as good because they are ours. We respond with crusading resistance, appealing to a tribal God. Change becomes unthinkable, and the injustices of the old system are multiplied. The English historian, Herbert Butterfield, has observed:

> Judgment in history falls heaviest on those who come to think themselves gods, who fly in the face of Providence and history, who put their trust in man-made systems and worship the work of their own hands.[2]

Those who stubbornly resist any thought of their own sin invite increasingly severe judgment, even if they manage to postpone the evil day and place that judgment on the backs of their children and their children's children.

If our ills involve God's judgment on us for our sins, the fitting response is one of repentance. When the prophets looked at the rising woes of Israel and Judah, their response was not a protest against their enemies, but a call to repentance.[3] They proclaimed that God was sending the Assyrians and Babylonians as punishment for the disobedience of His chosen people. When one admits that adversities are at least in part God's judgment, he then seeks to discover what he has done wrong.

In an attitude of repentance we may see some meaning in the way God's judgment comes upon us within history. Judgment comes to person and to society as God acts to destroy injustice and idolatry. It comes upon the individual as God breaks the pattern of a person's participation in injustice and his worship of the work of his own hands. It comes upon social groups as God attacks the unjust structures of society, patterns of social organization which prevent true community and which thwart rather than meet the neighbor's needs. Does God judge the sin and not the sinner? How can the two be separated? The sin grows out of the sinner's total rebellious personality. We may cling to our sin of racial injustice so tenaciously that destruction of injustice can come only with severe injury to the sinner. Judgment is a tearing down which comes upon all who stand in its way.

Only in a spirit of repentance and identification with the judged can we attempt to see where God is judging our racial sins. No part of society is exempt. White people can see distortions in their own personalities because of their exclusion and subjection of Negroes. In their fear and insecurity members of the dominant group in a segregated and prejudiced society may easily become obsessed with maintaining their superior social position. They are frequently subject to a gnawing guilt because of their practices. They constantly try to deceive themselves with claims that they know what the Negro wants or that they are actually acting in his best interest. Neither the ruler nor the ruled can be normal in a segregated society. Who will quarrel with the justice which penalizes those who by their power maintain superior status in this system?[4]

The "moderates" as well as the more obviously prejudiced whites suffer from the system. This elusive and silent mass of Southern society has paid its own price in today's racial tensions. The moderates may pride themselves on avoiding violence either for or against segregation. They voice their

---

[2] Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity and History* (New York: Scribner's, 1950), p. 60.

[3] Isaiah 1:2-20; 5:1ff.; 8:5ff.; Jeremiah 7:1ff.; 18:1ff.; *et passim.*

[4] See W. J. Cash, *The Mind of the South* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1954), pp. 54ff., for a discussion of the effects of the white man's position on his personality.

prejudice neither so loudly nor so often as more extreme groups. But neither have they voiced their democratic or their Christian convictions, of late years. To protect themselves, they have left the field to the uncompromising extremes. Thereby they have actually invited violence in the community. The South has paid for this default of its best leaders in terms of increased hatred and tension. Harry S. Ashmore has aptly described this situation:

> Over much of the region a man who is willing to endure the abuse of a raucous minority discovers that a considerable majority, while still deploring the necessity, is looking for a way out of the impasse. It is, however, a bewildered, unorganized majority, intimidated not so much by the militant segregationists as by the smothering mores of the Southern community. It remains impotent because it remains, for the most part, without public or private leadership.[5]

The moderate is finding that silence brings its special kind of judgment on the individual. Moderates have paid for their silence by loss of leadership and respect from either side. To be respected, power must be exercised. "When responsible men default, irresponsible men take power."[6] The crucial question for the South is whether and how moderates can regain their position of leadership in Southern society.

Judgment comes upon the whole region as well as upon its individual citizens for the injustices of its racial practices. It appears in the costs of maintaining a dual (and sometimes triple) school system which, for shortage of money, is below the national average. The South economically cannot afford this luxury of prejudice. Segregation takes its toll noticeably in Southern politics. "Keeping the Negro in his place" and the resulting one-party system have almost totally excluded careful public attention to other critical political problems—the region's low wage scale, its many poor farms, the low level of state expenditures for such needs as mental hospitals and unemployment compensation.[7] The high value which white Southerners place on segregation takes its toll of all other human values. This judgment touches every aspect of the South's existence.

### *The Inseparability of Judgment and Redemption*

If judgment is so pervasive, one may wonder if it is not a sign of God's rejection of man. In His judgment do we see His condemnation? If this is the case, then to see God's judgment in human events produces fear and stifles all man's effort. But God's judgment is not purposeless; it does not arise out of the necessity to reward evil with evil. The Biblical writers who recognized God's judgment in Israel's adversities believed that God was constantly reaffirming His covenant with His people. He sought to bring them to repentance in order that they might turn to worship Him and be made whole.[8] God's judgment is not opposed to His mercy. He destroys man's structures of injustice, not simply to punish man, but to bring healing to his life in society, to bring him to redemption. Redemption, like judgment, does not wait for the end of history. Like judgment, the healing which man can experience within history is never a complete salvation; but it is still the work of a saving God.

The judgment we experience in race relations, as it clears away our distorted social structures, presents us with the possibility of true community in spite of racial differences. The guilt which oppresses us because of our racial practices may prod us to find ways of response which do not distort our personalities—or those of other persons. The moderate's sense of defeat in

[5] Harry S. Ashmore, *An Epitaph for Dixie* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1957, 1958), p. 31.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[7] See V. O. Key, *Southern Politics in State and Nation* (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1950), for the most thorough discussion of the effects of racial concerns on Southern politics.

[8] Judges 2:1ff.; 6:1ff.; Hosea 1-3, 11; *et passim.*

the present situation may be the occasion for a more effective and imaginative witness to the needs of his time. The radical changes which are taking place in Southern life may open the way to relations between Negroes and whites in which the wounds of the past may be healed. Any kind of social organization, if it is maintained inflexibly for a long enough time, becomes oppressive. What was originally an advance in race relations, namely, the "separate but equal" doctrine, is being defended in a day when it has become a retreat. If a more adequate pattern of race relations is to be found, change—with its inevitable pain and destruction—must be accepted. The judgment which destroys our sinful ways is a means to the redemption which works healing in our society.

If men view judgment with this conviction, they do not fear it. It may be no less painful, but it is not ultimately God's rejection. Judgment instead becomes a part of God's reaffirmation of His covenant with His people. In this reaffirmation He again offers us His acceptance; He proclaims His faithfulness to heal men's sin. With faith that God is working redemption in the midst of our racial tensions, we find no need to defend the *status quo*. Instead we trust that God's acceptance of man underlies all change, even drastic change in one's own life.

### *The Response of Sacrifice*

Our interpretations significantly influence the way we act. If this is "what is going on" in our racial tensions—if in them God is seeking to bring healing to men in their social relations—then we are delivered from all fear for ourselves. We are set free to act, not in slavery to any social system, but in creative love for our neighbor. We are free even to sacrifice, for our well-being does not depend on our social status and security. Christian sacrificial action is the willingness to admit one's participation in the sins of his society and to take upon oneself voluntarily some of the suffering which this sin has caused. This is the most needed quality in the racial situation today.

Sacrifice cannot be carefully calculated in advance. We may be willing to suffer pain, but we cannot say in advance how much suffering will be our lot. The sacrifices which Southerners are voluntarily making, and contemplating, today, amply demonstrate this point. The minister who makes his Christian views known when the atmosphere is relatively calm may suddenly happen into an explosion and find that he has lost his pastorate, has subjected his family to risk, and has endangered his own life. Yet he could not know in advance whether the cost would be great or small. Some political figures who have sought acceptable ways to move toward compliance with the Supreme Court decision have discovered that as tensions have heightened, their political careers have come to an abrupt end. We may affirm our willingness to sacrifice, but we cannot set limits on the amount.

This problem faces Southerners in all their decisions in race relations. In a community in which a minority has hushed all rational discussion, people who challenge this oppression cannot know how many of their friends they will lose, how violent the community may become, how long the tensions may last. They can know, however, that without forthright leadership, without someone willing to speak reasonably, no solution will ever be possible. In some communities desegregated schools may temporarily mean poorer education for those who possess the greater advantages under segregation. Christian sacrifice involves a willingness to accept costs of this kind. Nothing in Christian faith justifies putting the burden of sacrifice on another group indefinitely. If one accepts a sacrifice in his education, or that of his children, he cannot be sure how long this kind of sacrifice

may be necessary, even though he may well expect that a unified South can soon overcome such problems.

The element of risk can never be removed from Christian sacrifice. Can we know that this is the place and the time to sacrifice? Should we not save our resources for a more crucial decision, rather than ruin our influence now? We cannot know. Neither can we know that any more crucial occasion will ever arise. The failure to respond to the race problem today may mean that people do not inquire about our views tomorrow. If the Christian waits for a decision in which his action will obviously make the difference between absolute good and evil, a decision more important than all other decisions in society, then he will never give himself in Christian love. Risk is always with us.

Christians who trust in an active, loving God do not demand an end to risk. We do not need to control the future, because we trust the God who does control it. We give what is needed in trust that we shall not be the only ones to give. We act, thankful that the solution to our racial problems does not lie totally on our own shoulders, and grateful that God is working through all his servants. We give of ourselves in the belief that redemption is being wrought in the midst of judgment and in trust that God is working a greater redemption than we now envision.

# PART II: THE PROBLEM OF RACE

## I. The Scientific Understanding of Race

*By* Douglas Jackson

During the past decade anthropologists, sociologists, and other social scientists have written far more about race relations than about race. For some time, it appears, the facts of race have been essentially determined. It seems that relatively little more can be learned about race until there is a great breakthrough in knowledge in either genetics or paleontology. On the other hand, however, the social relations growing out of race differences offer ample room for continuing studies for a number of years.

The commonly accepted data concerning race have not resolved all the differences of opinion among concerned social scientists. Differences in interpretation and in classificatory systems have produced considerable divergences.

Currently many social scientists deplore the use of the term "race." According to various anthropologists and biologists the be better described as subspecies, stock, or phenomenon commonly called race would breed. All but M. F. Ashley Montagu, however, recognize that there is little likelihood that the general public will change its habits with reference to the use of the word "race."

Race, then, is used by anthropologists as a word subject to certain reservations. A working definition of race has been given by Herskovits: "A race is a principal division of mankind, marked by physical characteristics which breed true."[1] This definition, which has widespread acceptance, is still couched in very general terms. The difficulty in pinning down the meaning of the word can be seen by an examination of the various classifications of race as made by the anthropologists and biologists. Currently most social scientists number three races, but some count four, five, or even thirty. Confusion arises from differences of opinion as to which physical characteristics

[1] Herskovits, Melville, *Man and His Works*, 1949, p. 133.

are important to the determination of race. If the experts can come no closer to agreement, laymen may expect difficulties.

Many laymen have distinguished races by the sole criterion of skin color. All classifications using this criterion distinguish the white, yellow, and black races. Others find brown and red races. All such color variations arise from the amount of pigmentation in the skin. For all colors the pigmentation is the same—only the amount of pigmentation varies. Black peoples have the most pigmentation while white (or pink) peoples have the least pigmentation. (Albinos have no pigmentation. Albinos occur in all races.)

No competent scientist would attempt classification of races on the basis of *any single* criterion. Although color of skin is one of the most satisfactory of the criteria by which races are classified, it is inadequate. For instance, the term "white Negro" is meaningless on the basis of color classification. Neither can the white Ainu of Japan nor the dark-skinned inhabitants of India be easily classified as to race on the simple basis of skin color.

Science does not yet have the answer as to how various populations came to differ in color. Today it is generally believed that all human beings, regardless of race, have descended from common ancestors. Color differences are not due to a polygenetic origin or man. The differences, therefore, are probably due to cumulative mutations. It is not possible, however, to know the color of the earliest ancestors. Hence we cannot know the original color which was subject to mutation.

The rise and persistence of color differences is generally attributed to variations in climate. Although the mechanics of genetic change are not fully understood, it appears that compensation for variations in sunlight is gained through pigment changes. It can be said with certainty that dark-skinned groups have never been found in areas deficient in sunlight nor have very light groups been able to withstand areas of intense sunlight for any extended period. Too much sunlight damages the nervous system of blonde peoples and probably damages the female reproductive system. On the other hand, in areas of limited sunlight darker persons are subject to rickets to a much greater extent than lighter persons. Light pigmentation prevails throughout the polar regions of Europe and Asia. In the northern Pacific area of North America Indians frequently have pale skins, green or gray eyes, and red hair.

Other physiological differences probably arise from climatic differences. It appears that tall, skinny persons survive in tropical areas while short, fat persons are best suited to polar regions. Differences in body form are not as distinctive as color variations, but they do help indicate the influence of climatic conditions upon the development and persistence of certain physical characteristics. The tall Watusi Negroes and the short Eskimos are the extreme examples of the influence of climate upon body form.

Anthropologists today select a number of physical characteristics as bases for classification into races. While these scientists differ as to which physical characteristics are important and as to the scale by which these characteristics are to be measured, they agree that races can only be delineated by the use of a combination of physical forms. One of the best recent studies makes use of the following traits: skin color, stature, head form, shape of face, hair, eyes, nose, and body build.[2] This study classifies three races: Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid. Each of these races is then divided into several sub-races.

Anthropologists measure selected physical characteristics of a large number of persons. If the race of the person can be easily

[2] Krogman, W. M., *The Science of Man in the World Crisis*, 1945.

ascertained, his measurements are used to help determine the average for his particular race. The different races have different average measurements for a number of physical characteristics. For example, the Negro race is characterized by a broader nose than is the Mongoloid.

Within each race there is a wide range of measurements for each physical characteristic. Greater differences exist between the extremes shown in any race than exist between the averages of any of the races. For example, Swedes have the narrowest noses while the Kajji Negroes have the widest. Yet, approximately half of the Swedes have noses broader than the Kajji Negro with the narrowest nose. It would be impossible to determine the race of a man from his nose measurement if his nose were 35 millimeters wide; he could easily belong to the narrow-nosed Swedes or the broad-nosed Negroes.

For every physical characteristic used to determine race there are similar variations. Some tall pygmies are even taller than some short Caucasoids. Frequently these variations make it impossible to determine a person's race by any series of measurements. These over-lapping ranges all tend to corroborate the common ancestry of all men.

In certain physical characteristics there are insignificant variations between the races. All races have the same types of blood. Although the relative frequency of occurrence of the various types of blood does differ, each race does have all four blood types. Blood from an "O" type Negro may be successfully used for a transfusion to any person with "O" type blood, whether he be Caucasoid or Mongoloid or Negroid. Variations occur also in respect to certain of the components of blood. The Negro, for instance, is far less likely to have the Rh negative factor in his blood than is the Caucasoid. But these differences in components do not hinder or aid in a blood transfusion.

Variations in the size of the brain are also unimportant. Many have tried to posit that the smaller brain of the Negro is indicative of inferior intelligence. No correlation has ever been established between size of brain and intelligence. Some geniuses have had small brains while many feeble-minded persons have large brains. If the size of brain were indicative of intelligence, the Eskimos would be the wisest of all the earth's inhabitants. The brains of Eskimos are, on the average, substantially larger than the brains of any other racial or sub-racial group.

There is no one race that is markedly inferior or sub-human. The Eskimo has the largest brain and the smallest amount of body hair. The Negro has the most highly developed limbs, lips, and hair. The Caucasoid has white skin and thin nose. Each of the traits mentioned stands at the point farthest removed from the common characteristics of apes. Hence, each of these groups is marked by outstanding variation and development from the characteristics of apes.

An important variation between racial groups, noted but not known to be directly related to any one physical characteristic, is the degree of tolerance for different diseases. The American Indians had little tolerance for smallpox which the European introduced into America. On the other hand, the European had little tolerance for the syphilis which the American Indian introduced into Europe. Today many Negro groups appear to have a great tolerance for malaria. A more thorough understanding of the various levels of disease tolerance is one of the areas of race-study which needs further investigation.

By definition a race is maintained because the physical characteristics which differentiate it from other races breed true. But, the averages for physical characteristics of a race change. The averages for physical characteristics of Mongoloids born in the

U. S. differ from those Mongoloids born elsewhere. As long ago as 1911—and corroborated in numerous tests in the intervening years—it was demonstrated that children of immigrants to the U. S. are larger than children of similar stock in the native land. Also, children born after the immigrant parents have been in the U. S. for several years are larger than children born shortly after arrival in this country. Third and fourth generation American citizens of the Mongoloid race tend to be more similar in size to the Caucasoid majority of the U. S. than to the Mongoloid population of their country of ancestral origin. Such racial differences in physical characteristics as do prevail may, therefore, be sharply diminished or completely eliminated by long-term changes in geographical distribution.

Social scientists do not refer to a "pure" race. They are aware that the present population of the earth is the result of many migrations and race mixtures. The races are mutually fertile. Herskovits has observed that "*no two human groups meet but that they produce mixed offspring.*"[3] This mixing process has gone on so long and over so wide a part of the earth that it largely explains the wide range within any one race as presently defined.

A study of the Negro population of one Mississippi Delta county indicated that more than 70% knew the identity of at least one ancestor who was white or Indian. The majority white population in the U. S. has sought to preserve its identity unchanged by classifying all persons having a single Negro ancestor as Negro. The present Negro population of the U. S. includes a number of persons who have more white ancestors than Negro.

The white population despite its devices has not been able to maintain its purity, however. Mixtures with Mongoloid races (including the American Indian) are allowed legally in a number of states. Some of these Indians have Negro ancestors. Additionally, sociologists have proved statistically that at least 2,500 (and perhaps as many as 30,000) Negroes "pass" into the white race each year. (There is little likelihood, however, that the Negro population of the U. S. is likely to decrease. Rather, the American Negro population seems to be achieving a homogeneity representing a half-way position between Caucasoid and Negroid groups.)

These data about race do not serve to explain the differences prevailing between the races as they exist in the world today. Nor can it be fairly denied that there are many differences which exist between the races. Such differences, however, are not to be explained by reference to innate, genetic variations. Rather, these differences are to be explained as cultural differences.

The members of one race are as capable of learning as are the members of another race. The differences that do exist are not indices of superior or inferior races. They are the result of exposure to different cultural patterns. A white American orphan was adopted by American citizens of Chinese ancestry and taken with them back to China. When he returned to the land of his birth he spoke Chinese fluently, but had difficulty with English. He spoke Chinese because he had been reared in a Chinese culture.

In the same way American Negroes residing in Northern states made higher scores on the Army Alpha intelligence test in World War I than did white inductees from Southern states. These scores told more about the educational systems of the various states than they told about racial mental ability. Nobel prizes for outstanding achievements have been awarded to persons of all races.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 139.

A Nisei Japanese student born in Mobile talks with a soft Alabama accent, dresses and thinks like an American, and is big man on the campus of an American university. A Harvard-educated Negro residing in New York speaks with the clipped accents of New England. The Indian trained at Oxford seems thoroughly British and not at all Asiatic. All evidence seems to indicate that any normal person *when given the opportunity* can learn the way of life of any people.

## II. The Role of the Supreme Court

*By* Arthur L. Harding

In the discharge of its duty to measure legislation against the United States Constitution, the Supreme Court of the United States seems ever-fated to be involved in controversy. The uproar which followed the decision in the School Segregation Cases of 1954 was to be expected, but actually it was less violent than that which has greeted certain other historic decisions.

As is usual in these situations, little has been said concerning the justice of the decision. Rather, complaints have centered on the usurpation of power, on the overturning of tradition, or on the unworthy motivation of judges. It is proposed here to examine briefly the validity of these objections.

Let it be noted first that the problem is not to be solved by appeals to majority opinion. It is probable that a majority of the people of the Deep South are opposed to the outlawing of school segregation. It is also probable that a majority of the people in the United States believe the decision to be just and correct. Neither of these statements, if true, is relevant. A major function of a written constitution is to protect certain rights and liberties of individuals and of minority groups against oppression by popular majorities. Majorities rarely need this protection. In any case in which legislative action is stricken down at the instance of an individual asserting his rights under the Constitution there probably is a thwarting of majority will. For the courts to abdicate or to flee this responsibility would be to destroy the essence of constitutional government as we have known it. At the same time, it would be an unacceptable distortion of constitutional federalism for the Supreme Court to yield to the pressure of nationwide majority opinion to invalidate legislation which is within the constitutional right of the State to enact.

The popular arguments directed against the School Segregation Cases may be summarized as follows: there is no constitutional authority in the United States Supreme Court to review the constitutionality of State legislation; the School Segregation Cases represent unwarranted invasion of the rights reserved to the States under the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution; the matter is for action by the Congress and not by the Court; the decision arbitrarily overturned earlier cases of the same court; and the decision is based not on law but upon the writings of assorted sociologists and the like.

True enough, the Constitution makes no explicit reference to review of State legislation by the United States Supreme Court. That such review is implicit seems to be beyond serious dispute. The Supremacy Clause of Article VI says: "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitu-

tion or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding." Article III provides that the judicial power shall be vested in the Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Congress may establish, and defines the judicial power to include "all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution." Any dispute as to the import of these two Articles must take into account the understanding on the part of the ratifying conventions, clearly reflected in Elliott's reports of those conventions, that the power of judicial review of the constitutionality of state legislation was proposed. Any doubt still lingering should be removed by the fact that the 1st Congress, in personnel little more than an adjourned session of the 1787 Constitutional Convention, provided in the Judiciary Act of 1789 for an appeal from the highest court of the State in cases involving a denial of a right claimed under the United States Constitution. Attempts radically to amend this provision, introduced after almost every major controversial decision, uniformly have failed.

Pragmatically, it should be said that this system of judicial review is the cement which has held the Union together over the years. Without it, the structure would have disintegrated over a century ago in the wake of Calhoun's Nullification Doctrine, now sometimes called Interposition.

Most vehemently argued, perhaps, is the contention that the School Segregation Cases are contrary to the Tenth Amendment. That Amendment provides: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." It will be seen that this amendment is of no value in determining what particular powers are granted the United States or are denied the States. For the answer to these questions, one must turn to other provisions.

Nothing can be found in the Constitution to empower the United States to establish or operate schools, except so far as that power may be implied in a limited way incident to another power such as that to govern territories, or to provide for the governance of the armed forces or of the Indian Tribes. Clearly there is nothing in the Constitution to prohibit the States from establishing and maintaining schools. It would seem that the operation of public schools is within the legislative competence of the States, and beyond the legislative competence of the Congress.

Finding that the operation of schools is a State Function under the Tenth Amendment does not solve the issues of racial segregation. A further inquiry must be made. Is the State's power to operate its schools uncontrolled as to the manner of its exercise, except as controlled by the State Constitution, or are there other controls imposed by the United States Constitution? To answer this query, one must turn to constitutional history.

While the Constitution in its original form, and with the Bill of Rights added, contained many provisions for the protection of individuals against oppression by the United States, it contained no provision to protect individual citizens from State oppression, except the prohibition of laws impairing the obligation of contracts, or of bills of attainder, and the Privileges or Immunities Clause of Article IV, designed to prevent a State from discriminating arbitrarily against a citizen of another State. Early cases invalidating State legislation involved statutes asserting prohibited power, such as laying duties on imports, or invading a field reserved exclusively for the Congress, such as the coinage of money, or interfering unreasonably with the exercise of a Congressional power such as that to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. In *Barron v. Baltimore,* decided in 1833, Chief Justice Marshall properly held that a citizen complaining of oppression by his own State would have to seek redress in his

State Court under his State Constitution; that the Federal courts could give him no relief. This doctrine culminated logically enough in the *Dred Scott* decision of 1857, probably the most controversial judicial decision in the history of the Republic.

Fear that the Congress and President elected in 1860 would seek by extra-constitutional means to nullify the doctrine of the *Dred Scott* decision contributed largely to the secession movement and to the Civil War. A determination that that doctrine would be changed, at least so far as Negroes were concerned, was large in the motivation of the ultimately victorious Union forces. Upon cessation of the rebellion, this determination was expressed in Reconstruction legislation of dubious constitutionality, purporting to rest on the right of an occupying military force. That such a change should be accomplished by constitutional means was soon apparent, and so the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments were proposed and ratified. The stresses under which ratification was accomplished inevitably gave rise to contention that the amendments were not adopted in a constitutional manner, but realism would seem to require a conclusion that if there were irregularities of procedure, they have been cured long since by lapse of time.

These Civil War amendments, so-called, marked an important change in constitutional theory, and were directed entirely to limiting or controlling powers conceded to be in the states. The Thirteenth prohibited slavery, theretofore lawful under State law. Under the original Constitution the States determined qualifications of voters. The Fifteenth Amendment provided that in exercising this power, the State should not discriminate "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Neither of these amendments is involved in the school segregation problem. It is the Fourteenth which must be studied.

The first sentence in the Fourteenth Amendment says: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside." The purpose of this provision was principally to nullify a possible interpretation of one of the opinions in the *Dred Scott* decision to mean that the Constitution as originally adopted contained an implicit denial of constitutional liberty to Negroes. From 1868 on, every living human being born and residing in the United States was to have the same constitutional protection as was afforded any other such being.

The Amendment then sets forth the Privileges or Immunities Clause ("No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;"), the Due Process clause ("nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law;"), and the Equal Protection clause ("nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."). The Privileges or Immunities clause has been little used, largely because of difficulty of defining privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States, as distinguished from those of its citizens of the several States. The Due Process clause is not immediately relevant to school segregation in the States, but it should be noted that it is under this clause that the great Natural Law tradition has been established as a part of the constitutional structure. So far as Natural Law or Natural Rights may be relevant, it must be remembered that that tradition is one of the rights of *human* beings, not merely of beings of a particular race or color.

The Equal Protection clause is highly relevant. Its benefits are guaranteed any person, white or black, within the jurisdiction of the State. This clause does not reduce the area of legislative competency of the State, as guaranteed by the Tenth

Amendment. It does mean that in exercising its undoubted power to operate public schools, the State must afford to each *person* an equality of treatment. Arbitrary denial of equality in educational opportunity by State action is invalid, whether the denial be based on religion, on vocation, on sex, or on race.

Even among the most vociferous critics of the School Segregation Cases, few are found to deny the constitutional right of the Negro to equality of educational opportunity. Rather the argument is that it is *not* the function of the *Court* to assure this equality, or, that the segregated system *does* give equality.

From the time of the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868, the United States Supreme Court has applied it in litigation before it, as it was accustomed to apply other constitutional provisions. That this is its duty under the Supremacy Clause of Article VI is clear, unless it is prohibited by the terms of the Amendment itself. The argument on this point centers on Section 5 of the Amendment: "The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." The insertion of these provisions in the Civil War Amendments was new; their purpose is easily discovered. At the end of the Civil War and prior to the ratification of the new amendments, the Congress had enacted Reconstruction and Civil Rights legislation. The constitutionality of that legislation was under attack. The inclusion of an express grant of Congressional power was designed to settle that issue, and it did.

That the Congress has an express power to legislate, to control, or to limit State legislation, or to control the actions of State officers, involving denial or impairment of the protections of the Civil War amendments, does not require a conclusion that the courts are powerless to act in the field. Reason opposes such a conclusion; otherwise the inaction of the Congress would nullify the constitutional provision. Ordinary principles of draftmanship would indicate that if the power of the Congress were to be made exclusive, the Amendment would provide that the Congress shall have *the* power to enforce the Article. It does not so provide.

The Supreme Court in the 1954 cases was obligated to determine whether the segregated school systems involved did or did not afford Negro pupils the equality guaranteed by the Equal Protection clause. At this point, the legal issues already had been decided. Whether the educational opportunity afforded *was* equal was a fact issue. The issue was not easily resolved. Such obvious criteria of inequality as inferior teachers, limited curriculum, ramshackle buildings were not involved. The question was whether substantial equality of the external paraphernalia of education would alone satisfy the requirement of equality; or perhaps, whether separate education *can* be equal. This problem is one of human psychology, of sociology. It is a question on which all of the resources of the social sciences should be brought to bear. At this point the judge is justified in seeking the opinions and judgments of those best qualified in those fields. It is of course common practice for courts to take expert opinion from non-legal fields. In any event the judges did seek this guidance, and concluded that "segregated educational facilities are inherently unequal."

So the conclusion is reached that the Supreme Court was obligated by the Constitution to decide whether the segregated system was equal and did decide it. The question was a difficult one of fact. The negative answer was not unreasonable. A half-century of the separate but equal doctrine had not produced equality. Of course, that all would agree with the decision was not to be expected.

But, how about the final argument, that the Court had recklessly overruled its own

prior decisions, that "separate but equal" education was the established law of the Constitution? This was not the case. No Supreme Court decision had held that equality of educational externals would always satisfy the Constitution. The case of *Plessy v. Ferguson,* decided in 1898 and frequently referred to in current discussions, upheld the constitutionality of separate-but-equal railroad accommodations. The problems are not identical. Equality in transportation would appear to be largely if not entirely a matter of externals: fare, frequency of service, quality and comfort of accommodations. The human relationships which bulk so large in education are wholly lacking in transportation. Separate railroad accommodations could be equal, although they rarely were. Also to be noted is that the Court in the *Plessy* case reserved for itself the determination of the "reasonableness" of segregation in particular instances. So in 1917 legislation requiring segregated housing was declared to be invalid.

The segregated education cases which arose after 1896 and prior to recent times involved complaints by citizens against specific inequalities, asking that they be removed. The Court, following its desirable practice of deciding constitutional issues only when they cannot be avoided, merely found a specific inequality to exist and required corrective action. In no case was the ultimate issue of the 1954 cases reached. Of these opinions, the strongest support for separate-but-equal is to be found in *Gong Lum v. Rice,* decided in 1927. In that case the Court held that the State might require a Chinese student to attend a segregated colored school. The petitioner had made no complaint of the inadequacy or inequality of the colored school as compared with the white school, but appeared to contend that the segregation pattern required a separate school for Chinese.

The 1954 decision may have come as a shock to laymen, but it was no surprise to the student of constitutional law. After the 1935 decision in *University of Maryland v. Murray* it was fairly apparent that the separate-but-equal doctrine was in danger. In any event, that decision did set off an attempt in segregated areas to improve the quality of Negro schools. After *Sweatt v. Painter* in 1950 it was certain what would happen. In that litigation a case of external equality had been made out, but the court found inequality in the intangible factors so important in legal education.

If the 1954 decision does overrule earlier cases, it does not necessarily follow that the latest decision is incorrect. Courts are properly slow to overrule prior cases, but they may be obligated to do so. Ancient mistakes are not to be permanently ensconced in the law. Many, if not most, judicial decisions are destined ultimately to fall before changing social conditions, increased human knowledge, accrued experience, and more acute human reason. That this is true is, notwithstanding the ensuing problems, a principal source of strength of the Anglo-American legal system.

Finally, concern with the language of the Tenth and Fourteenth Amendments is not to be permitted to obscure the fact that human liberty is not a fixed quantity in the Constitution but is an expanding category. In this all men must be permitted to share.

# III. The Southern Temper

*By* Merrimon Cuninggim

Once upon a time, in a community that practiced segregation, the minister of a church at the side of a tax-supported campus faced the prospect of observing World Brotherhood Sunday. He proposed to lay it on the line. Thus he prepared and delivered a brave sermon on the theme that "God shows no partiality, but in *every* nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him." The italics were his, because he felt they were God's.

At the conclusion of the service he did the customary thing of "throwing open the doors of the church" for any who might want to join. Now it happened that the institution across the street had recently been forced to admit a few Negroes to its graduate program. On this particular Sunday one of these students was sitting on the back row of the balcony. When the invitation was issued, he said to himself, "If that sermon is what this church believes, then this is the church for me;" and so he went forward.

The minister saw him coming and was filled with sudden anxiety. What to do? But there was only one thing to do, and in a twinkling he did it. He extended the hand of fellowship to the young Negro and took him into the church.

The minister knew that the next days would be hectic, and the first necessity was to get his own thinking straight. Thus fortified, he was ready for the onslaught. He would simply have to go through with it. For example, a group of influential ladies invited him to tea, and told him, "We have decided to join another church." But he had his answer: "What are you going to do when *that* church gets religion?" He also made more constructive remarks, and those ladies are still members of his church.

But the minister was not prepared for the outcome. A mid-week business meeting of the congregation had been scheduled for a date shortly thereafter. When the time came, and contrary to the custom of the church, the place was packed. Just prior to the opening of the session, the minister sidled up to a lawyer friend and asked, "To what do we owe this excellent attendance?" And this was the reply: "We heard that a few folks intended to cause you trouble about the Negro you took in, and all of us just decided to come out and back you up."

## I

But this was several years ago, before the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954. Could such a thing happen now? The gain that this episode represents has not been lost in that church or community. But since then, commentators tell us, Southern communities that earlier did not experience such a breakthrough have tightened up in their attitudes and emotions. We are led to believe that, today, dramatic instances of unforced desegregation are extremely unlikely if not impossible. The Supreme Court decision, it is said, has represented a set-back to the cause of better race relations.

Yet the problem, as we all know, is not simple. That the Supreme Court decision has brought discord is patent, but that it was therefore a bad thing is not the only available conclusion. Even if it were, what comfort would there be? Time does not run backward, and it is the *present* situation that faces us. By the same token it is *we*, not our fathers or our sons, who must grapple with it.

It behooves us, then, to examine as thoughtfully and honestly as we can the current temper of the South. What is our mood? What is the prevailing atmosphere in which we work? We shall not escape the fact that our subconscious answers to these

questions will shape what we say and do. Better, then, to make our assessment consciously. Where do we stand?

(The usual humilities of approach to this topic are much in order here. I confess to certain limitations of treatment and claim no special insights. The "we" refers to Southern whites, for I cannot speak the mind of my Negro brother. As for that, I cannot pretend to definitive knowledge of my white brother, either. This article is offered simply as the judgment of one white Southerner about himself and his fellows.)

To preserve any chance we may have for dispassionate analysis, we need to dig back into our past for the sake of getting some perspective on the present. Without regard to the problem of race we need to understand the special aspects of the Southern character that have made us what we are. That character can best be described, perhaps, by a series of paradoxes, of which six have pertinence for our inquiry.

1. The effort to delineate the Southern spirit itself poses the first paradox: we are of the South, and yet also of the nation. Beginning long before the Civil War our regionalism was remarked upon. Yet our nationalistic fervor, and even our internationalism, serve as its complement. We are much the same as other Americans, but also different. We love both the Union and the Confederacy. If one of these is still alive, so is the other, for us. Though such a combination of breadth and narrowness does not always produce tension—e.g., loyalty to the U.S. and the U.N.—the possibility is there, and becomes real when national will and regional custom collide.

A footnote is called for in respect to the supposed differences within the South. If one were dealing solely with the facts of Southern existence—economy, education, topography, health and all the rest—major distinctions coud be drawn among the Deep South, the Mid-South, the Border States, the Southwest, etc. But our concern is with the intangible Southern temper, which is homogeneous if not uniform, differing in degree from mountain to piedmont to coastal plain, but hardly in kind. Like the other illustrations to follow, this first paradox of regionalism-nationalism is present all across the South.

2. We are romantic and pragmatic—not that some of us are one and some the other, but that nearly all of us are something of both in the same package. Devoted to the policy of moderation and gradualism, to the art of the possible, we take delight in the unreal, the chimerical, the impossible. This is not merely the anachronism of fact—white columns and smokestacks, machines amid the magnolias. This is a paradox of the human spirit, a strange streak of pragmatism in the midst of a romantic outlook. To understand the South today, one must realize that the white Southerner is a hard-headed sentimentalist.

3. We are full of belligerence, yet we know defeat. It needs to be remembered that the Southerner is the only Anglo-Saxon anywhere on the earth's surface who has been beaten in a major military enterprise in the last hundred and fifty years. But as historical fact, defeat happened to our grandfathers, not to us. It is as a quality of the human spirit, the sense of defeat, that it applies to us today. It makes us both more sympathetic with other beaten peoples, and more belligerent. We will fight before the hat is dropped, and we will bleed for others as well as ourselves.

4. A similar paradox is the combination, pride and poverty. The reference is not to poverty as a sociological condition but as, again, a spiritual experience. The days of destitution are past, for the South is partaking increasingly of the nation's prosperity. But the days of humiliation linger in the subconscious memory. We are as good as anybody else! But the difference is, we feel we must say so. We have *got* to look

good in the eyes of the world. And when we look bad, it hurts double.

5. The pinch of these paradoxical elements in the Southern character has produced another pair of unlikely companions, hospitality and estrangement. Like other Americans we are a gregarious people, and we have made special point of cultivating the myth of Southern hospitality. Yet it is not all myth, though the truth about us also includes mention of stratifications based on family and class and position, as well as color. Hospitable in part, we are also estranged from each other. As beliefs about ourselves we cherish the former and deplore or deny the latter. Thus when circumstances increase the incidence of the trait we deplore, the violence to our self-esteem is considerable.

6. The final paradox is simply an exaggeration of what can easily be identified elsewhere in the United States. It is the contradiction between individualism, even the spirit of rebellion, and conformity. We treasure the right to be different but hesitate to exercise it. We protest regimentation, but we want to make our protest all together. Thus when some special ordeal hits the South, we can be expected to band together in rebellion against the outside threat, and woe to those non-rebellious who refuse to conform.

Many characteristics of the Southern spirit could be mentioned, including a number that would put the Southerner in a more attractive light than these selected qualities suggest. But as background for our consideration of the present Southern attitude toward the race problem, these paradoxical elements are the most pertinent: we are regionalist as well as nationalist and internationalist in sympathies; we are both incurably romantic and pragmatic; we feel both belligerant and defeated; both prideful and impoverished in spirit; hospitable to, yet estranged from, our fellows; rebellious and conforming. By virtue of these aspects of our character we were ripe to be torn apart by the Supreme Court decision.

## II

But the first response was shock, a kind of cold acquiescence, and relative silence. When it became clear, however, that little national leadership for compliance with the decision would be forthcoming, Southerners found their voice, sharpened their skill in political maneuvering, and except in the Border States prepared massive resistance. Nearly every competent observer of the Southern scene agrees that opposition to desegregation has grown increasingly bitter in the last year or so.

Yet our analysis of the present Southern temper on the racial problem cannot confine itself to such a generalization. The characteristics we have just noted suggest that the attitudes of Southerners are likely to be much more complex and contradictory than one sweeping statement can adequately embody. We need to look at specific trends and developments of our understanding of the paradoxical general qualities of the Southern spirit, we shall find that certain specific attitudes toward race give evidence both of the growing resistance to desegregation and of what seems to be a growing support for law and order, if not for integration itself. Out of the host of developments to which attention might properly be given, I choose four for special observation.

1. At the beginning we must deal with a strange contradiction that current analyses unwittingly present. On the one hand, it is said that the South is monolithic in its opposition to the Supreme Court; on the other we are told that the South is torn with strife. Unity, yet discord—how can this be? Which judgment is correct?

Our knowledge of the Southern taste for paradox prepares us to believe that both may somehow be true. On the one hand the

overwhelming body of Southerners seem to want no part of integration. Advocacy of, even softness toward, desegregation is accurately gauged as political, economic and social suicide. Those who conclude otherwise are either blind or tragically selective in their choice of evidence.

On the other hand, strife is also present. Nor is it merely that of the embattled, unified South with the outside world. It exists within the South, yet even here not solely with the minority who actually favor desegregation. These two occasions for discord can account for only a part of the tension which grips the South. Another part, but still not the whole story, is the factor to be noted in item No. 4, below—the cleavage along lines of color

The remainder, most often omitted in current discussions of the problem, yet perhaps most significant of all, is the strife that is taking place within the mind and heart, and very soul, of the individual white Southerner. All but the most insensitive and ignorant feel a sense of guilt about the segregated system they outwardly defend. As Waldo Beach has said, "The troubled conscience of the Southerner . . . may be deeply hidden beneath layers of custom and rationalization, but it is there. Even the fury of the fanatic racist . . . , which seems so sure and unambiguous, is the more frenetic because it covers an anxious insecurity or hides a deep alienation from self."

The outward near-uniformity of attitude, then, is paralleled by the inner turmoil of spirit. The conflict is getting sharper as more and more Southerners are called upon to declare themselves one way or the other. But the increasing sharpness of conflict has within it the hope of its own eventual resolution, for it is composed not alone of stubborn defense of an untenable position but also of growing awareness that it *is* untenable, because immoral. The essential encounter is of the Southerner, not with the outside world or with the Negro, but with himself.

2. Before things begin to cool off, however, they may get hotter. One distressing evidence is the enervation, even disappearance, of the so-called "moderates." People of poise are afraid to speak, for fear their very moderation will get them caught in controversy. Thus they remain silent, and the extremists hold the floor.

This was first suggested to me last fall by two Little Rock businessmen. "But," I protested, "you are fortunate to have Harry Ashmore and the *Arkansas Gazette* in Little Rock." "No," they said, "he's a radical." Then as we discussed the definition of a moderate, it became clear that they considered him to be one who has not spoken. Once a person speaks, even if all that he says is, "Obey the law," he has taken sides. Ashmore may consider himself a moderate, but he is so no longer to the segregationists.

The corollary is that a person may speak and act effectively only once. From then on he is branded, and someone else must assume his pose of temperateness. The situation in this regard could easily be exaggerated, but to whatever extent it is true—and it seems to be increasingly characteristic of portions of the South—it is a most deplorable development. Yet the hopeful side of even this distressing situation is that when it gets bad enough, it may call forth many more spokesmen for decency and order, and even for justice and goodwill, than might otherwise be prompted to reveal themselves.

3. Parallel to the present enervation of the moderates is the growing irrelevance of facts. Some brave folks are still trying to discuss the problem on the basis of the data—sociological, anthropological, educational, ethical, and all the rest. But a frightening host of Southerners do not want the facts and do not intend to be

swayed by them. They want only support for their own position; and they are undeterred, at least outwardly, by its being unfactual.

Here is a major explanation of the relative ineffectiveness of educators and clergymen, two groups that are taught to respect the logic of scholarship and the relevance of ethical principle. They find themselves helpless in a different kind of debate. Moreover, they are handicapped by an inability to employ the methods as well as the content to which their professions make them loyal. Opposed to their belief in fair play is a resurgence of the kind of tactics to which Senator McCarthy's name became attached. As some commentators have noted, just when the rest of the nation is recovering from McCarthyism the South is working up a sequel. The home-grown integrationist, and even the soft-speaking moderate, are apt to find themselves labelled, "Communist!" This and similar devices are used not alone by the "poor whites" who feel themselves economically and socially threatened by the advancing status of the Negro; in recent days some people of privilege have joined the ranks of hysteria—"the Ku Klux Klan in Cadillacs," they have been called. But even this cloud has its silver lining for those who believe that truth cannot permanently be flouted nor fair play permanently foregone.

4. In the meantime, however, the development of these various moods has occasioned and in turn been aided by a shift in the relationship of white Southerners with Negroes. Passive prejudice has been displaced by active suspicion. Old patterns of paternalism have weakened; new patterns of enmity have appeared. Distrustful of each other, whites and Negroes have become uncommunicative. In current analyses this factor is always given large and justifiable emphasis in explaining the present temper of the South.

But the counterweight is not so widely noted, and perhaps understandably, since it is only just beginning to make its influence felt. The effort is being made in many places to bring whites and Negroes together for interchange of opinion and common cause in action. As this movement grows it is taking the form not of a return to old ways of communication between superiors and inferiors but of new ways of mutuality among equals.

The Southern attitude toward the racial problem, therefore, is subject to no easy generalization, for while it adds up to a picture of growing resistance to integration, it also furnishes signs of a growing support for eventual compliance with the Supreme Court decision. As we are always reminded, resistance is greater in one place, and signs of promise brighter in another; but the sub-regions of the South differ among themselves in degree, not in kind, on both these responses. In all sections there is outward rigidity, yet inner strife; moderates feel helpless and are often silent; facts are likely to be irrelevant and tactics evasive, even brutal; and whites and Negroes are at suspicious arm's length. But the basic characteristics of the Southern spirit explain not merely the existence but also the inevitable impermanence of these tempers. Our paradoxical qualities have brought us to this point but by their very nature cannot leave us here. We know quite well that we are in transition, culturally and spiritually; from what, we also know, but to what, we do not yet see or are not yet willing to admit.

## III

The special interest of this article and its companion pieces, however, is the meaning of the present situation for churchmen, both ministers and laymen. What can be said about the Southern temper that applies specifically to the churches and their witness to the Gospel?

It is time to return to the story with which we began. Though it is dated and localized in its details, it suggests three points of pertinence for churchmen irrespective of time, place or denomination. In the rough outline of what happened some years ago in a little college town we can get a foretaste of what can happen, indeed of what is already taking place, in churches all across the South.

1. Note that the minister both spoke and acted, and that his speaking had little impact until his action supported it. Ever and anon we hear complaints that the witness of churchmen on the problem of race is feeble. In the recent symposium, *With All Deliberate Speed*, Wallace Westfeldt declares, anent his description of various "Communities in Strife": "The position of the clergy is, so far at least, indecisive." The issue of *Christianity and Crisis* for March 3, 1958, given over wholly to "The Southern Churches and the Race Question," calls attention to "the moral gap between creed and deed," and chides the churches for their "hypocrisy" and their tendency toward "institutional self-preservation."

Yet the editors themselves recognize, to say as much "is facile . . ., but it is hardly of much avail." It is part of the factual record, to be sure, that churches have done little to aid the process of desegregation, but it is also part of the record that the witness is growing in both scope and effectiveness. Once there was much talk and little action, for soon after the 1954 decision churchmen passed firm resolutions in their solemn assemblies but let the matter rest there. In more recent days, however, talk and action have been going hand in hand. Often the action has to be discreet in order to be fruitful, but he who wants to know can ferret out its evidence in place after place.

And with the increasing activity of churchmen is coming a re-examination of the value of thoughtful pronouncement. For a while the mood was to set talk and action against each other, to deplore the proliferation of the former and the paucity of the latter. But this false antithesis is now being abandoned, for it is widely recognized that public statement as a form of action is not to be disparged. The statements of pastors in Richmond, Atlanta, Houston and Dallas, to mention only four, are significant actions in themselves, and are leading to other activities of courage and influence.

2. If ministers are beginning to combine talk and action, and to engage in more of both, what about the laymen? Here another easy antithesis is offered us. In the same issue of *Christianity and Crisis* to which reference has been made, the reports from all five of the leading Southern denominations—Baptist, Disciple, Episcopal, Methodist and Presbyterian—stress that the racial question "has created a wide gulf between the pulpit and the pew." Broad variance does indeed exist. Ministers often feel held back, laymen feel pushed; and as each group resists these pressures, the cleavage is likely to grow.

This fact, however, is only one side of the situation; the other side is represented by the punch-line of our little story, above. The layman said to his minister, ". . . all of us just decided to come out and back you up." In a recent address on "The Church and Integration in Texas," Dr. Harold Kilpatrick, Executive Director of the Texas Council of Churches and himself a Presbyterian layman, reported a conversation he had with a Presbyterian State Senator who had voted consistently for the segregation bills in the Texas Legislature. Dr. Kilpatrick said, "I pointed out that he was voting exactly opposite to the official position of his church. He replied that the lay people were for segregation even if the preachers were against it. I countered by

reminding him that the church pronouncements were passed by bodies that were half laymen. The Senator then conceded that he might have voted differently in a church assembly from the way he did as a member of the Texas Senate."

Lest a cynical spirit miss the point, note the confession and the opportunity it suggests that the churches possess. Clergy versus laity is not the bitter contrast we have been led to suppose. When ministers truly lead, many laymen can be expected to follow. Heartening evidence exists that laymen are more ready to follow than we have dared assume. The greatest single weakness in the strategy of Southern churches is the failure to realize upon this opportunity; but its existence is the greatest ground for hope.

3. The final item of relevance in the episode of the Negro student's being received into the church was the inescapable character of the minister's behavior. He was caught, and he knew it. It was the Gospel, in confrontation with circumstance, that had caught him. When the Gospel is preached, and heard, and believed by both preacher and hearer, old customs are shaken and new relationships emerge.

The vulnerable spot in the Southern armor is the widespread sensitivity to the Christian faith. The strongest sword in the hands of the church is its only appropriate weapon, the Gospel of Christ. Segregationists tend to make their argument on misunderstandings and falsehoods about many things, even sacred ones. For their own purposes they have often twisted the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and even the Bible itself. But they have not succeeded in identifying their position with the mind of Christ, for the spirit of Jesus is patently opposed to racial prejudice and discrimination. As Harry Ashmore says in his volume, *An Epitaph for Dixie*, ". . . not even the most determined bigot can make a segregationist out of . . . Jesus Christ."

Then, for summary, we need to add one further characteristic of the basic Southern spirit and make one further comment on the Southern attitude toward race. The Southerner is deeply religious; his churches thrive and he has a profound respect for them. Even this quality partakes of paradox, however, for he flirts with unfaith at times and often enjoys his immorality. Yet the Church has a strong hold upon him and he is restless in his disobedience of its voice.

The pertinence of this quality for assessing the present Southern temper is obvious. If the church knows its own Gospel, its potential influence for good is literally immense. There are increasing signs, in all denominations and all parts of the South, that this is becoming so. The situation is bad and may even get worse for a while; but it is better than it looks on the surface. For the conscience of churchmen is stirring and beginning to move.

## IV. The Role of the American Churches

*By* R. F. Curl

### *Two Present Day Frontiers*

America now faces two decisive frontiers. The space-age is here. Unless we are able to expand our mastery of the physical universe, we may be doomed. No timid voices halt our adventure into this essential essay. Scientists and educators, politicians and industrialists unite in assuring us that we are competent to meet the formidable challenge. Boldly the nation girds every resource to meet the sudden summons to pass across the frontiers into an age of interstellar activity.

But with groping hesitation and divided

purposes this nation lingers, reluctant to cross the second great frontier of our times: the widening domain of man's right relationship to man. Yet, in an age when space is annihilated, the matter of human relations ought to be paramount. For while the moral and spiritual principles governing such relations are eternal, their application becomes urgently imperative in a nuclear era. Men now have but two choices: they all learn to live as brothers or they all die in misuse of power discovered.

This spiritual problem of human relations becomes, therefore, of greater moment than the physical problems of our space-age. Our prime problems in this day are not guided missiles, earth satellites, spaceships, and military weapons. The big concern is how we humans can live in mutual helpfulness in our new and expanded universe. The social scientist, the theologian, the ethicist, and the prophet of God are as needful in present-day America as the natural scientist. This nation will pay dearly for any forgetfulness that scientific superiority cannot substitute for moral integrity and spiritual perceptivity.

International problems in a nuclear age cannot find solution through the military might or the scientific superiority of one people over another. They must be solved through human understanding and through co-operation among the peoples of the world—and perhaps the peoples of the universe. A space era has no room for trifling concepts of inferiority and superiority based on race or other accidental factors. Either all men shall be one or there will be no men left. We have the know-how to destroy one another; we must have the will to preserve one another.

This universal problem of human relations is pin-pointed in America. It centers in Negro-Caucasian relationships. Can sixteen million Negroes and one hundred and fifty-five million whites learn the way of equal citizenship and Christian brotherhood in this nation? If we can, perhaps America may lead the whole world across looming horizons into a new age of man's oneness under God. If that can be done, then all of us can stop piling up instruments of intercontinental mass destruction and avert the pending massacre of the human race. On the other hand, if American whites and blacks, living in a land dedicated to human freedom and equality, cannot find this road, what hope is left for the billions of mankind? Ours is culturally and ideologically the ideal experimental testing ground for working toward a solution of the problems of race relations. And assuredly the present time is the day which the Lord hath made and committed to our hands for this purpose.

In the face of so great a challenge we find ourselves a divided people. No sure voice unites us. Divisive shibboleths and delaying tactics confuse our people so that the great issues of civil and human rights, as well as the rights of Christian brotherhood, are submerged and denied in a welter of outmoded traditions, pagan prejudices, political subterfuges, and religious hesitancies.

A sure, prophetic voice is needed; a calm, wise, yet clarion call to courageous action is demanded; intelligent leadership must simplify the issues, set patterns, and unite our people to follow basic convictions which they, as Americans and Christians, already hold. Nothing less than this is the responsibility of the Christian churches of America. This frontier of race relations is religious. The Church is God's agent to do something. The motivations from which action can arise, the wisdom by which action may be directed, and the patterns which action must take: all these are work for the Church. Only at her own peril and to the grave danger of all mankind can the Church neglect this task. What, then, can the churches do? What is their responsibility? What, then, have the churches been doing?

How do they discharge their responsibility?

*Divine Demands*

Since the question of race relations is theological, the churches must seek to *discover and declare divine demands.* Any approach which evades God's stake in the issue is inadequate; any humanistic solution, insufficient.

With rigorous exactitude the churches seek God's will for His children who, although of one blood, are of differing pigmentations. In fact no other issue receives more attention in American churches. Mounting volumes of literature and multiplying pulpit pronouncements have come from researches in schools of theology and social action agencies. Thousands of courses have enlisted millions of church members in study classes. And still the secret prayers of countless saints undergird the search for God's will.

While no uniform agreement has been reached as to procedures and patterns necessary and although many decided differences of opinion exist in regard to details of timing and application of remedial measures, practically unanimous consensus has been reached in the churches as to the basic demands God lays upon us in our human relationships. Wide, although not universal, acceptance of these fundamentals has been given by the rank and file church membership. Even in the worst islands of prejudice most American Christians would agree that we are all God's creatures, redeemed by Christ, and under imperative to live together as one family in justice and righteousness. Few are the discordant voices denying such basics.

This agreement is indicated in summations of divine demands issuing all the way from the Christian Council of South Africa to the Board of Social and Economic Relations of The Methodist Church. Typical is a pronouncement coming from the last named group, including such assertions as these: 1. "All nations of men have a common origin and in the eyes of God constitute a single family;" 2. "Man was created in the image of God and therefore every human being is of infinite worth;" 3. "God shows no partiality;" 4. "Jesus Christ came to redeem every man regardless of race or nationality;" 5. "Persons who respond to the call of Christ in love and obedience enter a new kind of fellowship in the Church where racial barriers are transcended;" 6. "The Church is called and empowered by God to reconcile a divided humanity and to unite all peoples into one family of God;" 7. "Each member of the Church is summoned by God to work where he is toward overcoming misunderstandings and antagonisms that men may dwell together in unity."[1]

Few Christians would dispute the truth of these assertions. But when applied, they are dynamite to blow out of existence every "Jim Crowism" in American life. Remarkable tribute is due the Church of our day that such revolutionary principles should have received so wide acceptance in so brief a period of emphasis.

In their discovery of the divine demands the churches seek to set the American problem in proper context. They have found, on the one hand, that race is a universal problem; there can be no American solution; there can be no partial resolution of the matter. Race relations are global and require global masteries. The Methodist Church in recent months has witnessed a series of conferences on human relations criss-crossing the nation and drawing thousands of thoughtful members of that communion together for serious consideration of racial problems. Every conference was set in a perspective of world horizons.

[1]*The Bible Speaks on Race,* Pamphlet of Board of Social and Economic Relations, The Methodist Church, 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois. Acknowledged to be based on a similar statement from the Christian Life Commission of the Baptist General Convention of Texas.

But, in declaring the divine demands, the churches have taken care, on the other hand, to emphasize that the problem in America is not to be solved by scattering it to the four winds of the earth. The churches have found and do not hesitate to say that this is an American problem to be solved at home by American Christians. Two instances may be cited. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., meeting in Philadelphia in May, 1956, emphasized individual and local church responsibility in such purely American aspects of the problem as residential segregation, job discrimination, White Citizens Councils, and reprisals on ministers and laymen for fidelity in following conscience in condemning and in seeking to remedy racial injustices.[2] The Church of the Brethren in West Virginia closes a bold statement pointing up the personal responsibility of individual members in many specific areas of action by saying, "Our goal must be no less than an integrated public school and church in an integrated community. We appeal to all Brethren to give courageous leadership toward this goal with calmness, sympathy, and seasoned judgment."[3]

The American churches recognize this discovery and declaration of divine demands as primary. Social ethics has no adequate basis save in theological truth. Already the world is indebted to American churches for the search for God's will and way for all races of the one human race. No doubt further truth will break forth from His Word. The search continues as the churches endeavor to clarify, to state simply, and to pronounce positively these divine demands.

### *Conscience Compulsion*

The American Churches, however, cannot be content with the discovery and declaration of divine demands. For men to know the truth does not guarantee that they shall do the truth. Principle unpracticed is principle unpossessed. The churches, therefore, also have fundamental responsibility to *compel the conscience.*

In this regard we find a mixed picture. In many respects the churches have done a superb job in compelling the conscience of this nation toward racial right. But in many ways they lag and must apologize for the dilatory manner in which practice limps behind principle discovered and declared.

Thanks, however, to the prickings of the Church, most of us can no longer live with unthinking acceptance of segregated patterns without a sense of guilt. This is true not only of individuals but likewise of whole groups and the entire nation. Individuals, communities, and whole states now in rebellion against the legal forces working to destroy segregation concede theirs to be only delaying tactics. And somehow they seem to realize—and often to admit—that final defeat will issue as much from the compulsions of their own consciences as from due operation of law. Prophetic processes in American churches produced this new moral climate.

Oppressed peoples of minority groups are indebted to the churches for so compelling the conscience of the nation as to permit judicial expression through Supreme Court decrees. Christian churches created the convictions, conditioned the climate, and compelled the conscience of the nation to recognition that "Fundamental law must be intimately concerned with spiritual values."[4] If it had not been for the churches, the day would not yet have dawned in which positive judicial expression could be given to a moral interpretation of the basic law of the land. Somebody had been preaching and

[2] *General Assembly Pronouncements*, 1956, Presbyterian Distribution Service, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

[3] Mimeographed *Resolutions* adopted by the West Virginia Conference of the Church of the Brethren, 1956.

[4] Charles Fairman, "The Attack on the Segregation Cases," *The Presbyterian Outlook*, February 25, 1957.

pricking the American conscience to evoke a statement like this: "The integrity of the individual, his equal worth in the sight of God, his equal rights and obligations of citizenship and his equal protection under law—these are the very foundation of the American system of laws."[5]

Still much remains for the Christian churches in their task of conscience compulsion. In these days of dire distress, as the nation adjusts to new concepts of racial relations, the temptation is to temporize and accommodate. The cry that race relations have worsened must be answered by the hard fact that present events only reveal the intrinsic evil of those relations down the years. The American conscience must not be allowed to rest at any half-way station. With moderation and with understanding of the present difficulties the churches must insist that divine demand is upon us and that there can be no needless tarrying until man's brotherhood has been established in justice and righteousness.

The churches know well that morality and spiritual virtue cannot be compelled. But the keeping of the law, obedience to constituted judicial processes, and the preservation of human and civil rights create the climate for morality and virtue. These can and must be compelled. There is no governmental evil in forcing people to do what some people do not want to do. Those who mock the law, denounce the courts, and prevent the exercise of civil and human rights are enemies of both God and this nation. As such they must be exposed without mercy or abatement. Under whatever name they masquerade, they must be unmasked as foes of Christian principles and accepted democratic ways of American life.

Eighty Atlanta ministers, one hundred and seventy-three Houston clergymen, and thirty-three Columbus, Georgia, religious leaders are examples of increasing numbers in the churches who, compelled by conscience, take courageous stand to say that "All Americans, whether black or white, have a right to the full privileges of first-class citizenship." And still the churches will compel until, in communities everywhere, others of us shall speak up and act out for the right.

### *Establishing Examples*

One other great responsibility rests upon the churches of America: to *establish examples*. It is never sufficient just to know and to will. Times of change demand patterns and techniques. Who better can say how it should be done than the Church which has said it must be done? The churches are obligated to set patterns both within their own fellowship and in society.

Redemption begins in the fellowship. If the divine demands cannot be fulfilled within the domain of God's own people, little hope may be entertained that they shall become universally accepted. The world is justified in saying to the churches, "Physician, heal thyself."

Good start has been made among the churches in putting their own houses in order. Integrating processes at denominational levels are opening institutions and revising structures. The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. has absorbed its all-black group, the Snedecor Synod, into other synods. The Methodists, whose Negro membership far exceeds that of all other predominantly white Protestant groups combined, are spending $200,000 in examination and appraisal of their entire jurisdictional system with special reference to the all-Negro Central Jurisdiction. By the requisite majorities a constitutional amendment has been adopted to make possible the gradual dissolution of this Negro unit.

The "nub" of the matter, however, is at the local church level. The last thirty years have witnessed great progress in de-

[5]President's Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services, *Freedom to Serve*, 1950.

segregation at this point. Inter-racial congregations of many types and in all sections of the country are being projected. American Baptists report that in 1956 twenty-one per cent of their congregations had some form of Negro-white integration.[6] In this they are no exception; almost all denominations are finding growing response to their encouragement of open membership in their congregations.

The statement adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. at St. Louis last December forms fitting epitome of the attitude and aim of the American churches in this matter:

> Racial segregation is contradictory to the teaching of Jesus. . . . The majority of the communions in the National Council of Churches have spoken out against racially exclusive policies and practices within the churches. There is increasing movement in the direction of developing racial inclusiveness at all levels of the churches' life and work. . . . The General Assembly of the National Council of Churches reaffirms at this time its renunciation of the pattern of racial segregation both in the churches and in society, as a violation of the Gospel of love and of human brotherhood. . . . The General Assembly commits itself, and urges the member churches and all of their constituencies to commit themselves, to strengthen further the efforts and to increase the work of the churches, national, regional, and local, to achieve as soon as possible a non-segregated society.[7]

As this exhortation indicates, American churches recognize obligation to establish examples in society as well as within their own fellowships. Racial righteousness cannot be segregated within church walls. Integrating processes must permeate the structures and customs of community life. Much of the criticism presently levelled at churchmen and churches by the foes of racial justice arises because of their efforts to further desegregation in society. Traditionalists assume that ministers are meddlers in attempting as citizens to establish examples of racial righteousness in realms beyond the ecclesiastical. But with commendable serenity and persistent zeal churchmen continue to speak and act for desegregation in schools, transportation, voting privileges, housing, and equal economic opportunity.

Many instances could be cited. Journalist Ronnie Dugger relates a notable case occurring in Texas. Led by the Texas Council of Churches, clergymen from Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish faiths united in bold and definite action to oppose racist legislation pending in that state.

Opposition through sneers and slurs from politicians proved no deterrent. The very few cries of protesting distress from within the churches themselves served only to indicate that the vast majority of Texas church people were conscience-committed to a cause for which many of them were not yet altogether ready to act. As Das Kelly Barnett, Episcopal theologian, interpreted the matter, the leaders were prompted by the feeling that "Until we can bring to bear, in some form of organized expression, the attitudes, insights, and conscience of the Christian people of Texas upon our political problems, we fail to be responsible to God." So effective were the efforts of these Texans that only three of more than a dozen vicious race-baiting bills were enacted. Dugger declares that this episode indicates that:

> Churchmen, less vulnerable than politicians, more trusted as ethical leaders than any other group in the community, have a special obligation in the coming crisis of human rights in America. If those in the south will take an active stand against violence, and thus in favor of the orderly processes of the law, they can do more for equal rights than all the politicians in Washington. We learned again in Texas that men of religion are not always defrocked, transferred or repudiated when they take their own vigorous part in the decision-making of democracy; that they can lead, and lead well, in

[6] "Reporting on Racial Inclusiveness of American Baptist Churches," 1956, Department of Christian Friendliness, American Baptist Home Mission Societies, 164 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

[7] A Statement of Policy Adopted by the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., St. Louis, Mo., Dec. 5, 1957, Distributed by The National Council of the Churches of Christ, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

the times of loneliness for the best and highest principles of man.[8]

Negroes have demonstrated that they have much to offer in establishing examples toward racial justice in society. Dr. Martin Luther King and his thousands of fellow-Christians in Montgomery have not been alone in exemplifying the spirit of Christ through passive resistance in love to criminal obstructions operating to annul due working of law. Integration cannot be a one-way process. Both races must share in the adventure; this is not the white man's burden but the burden of us all; and examples must be established from both sides.

This then is the role of the American churches in the present national and international racial scene: To find God's will in *divine demands*; to *compel the conscience* of Christians and others to fulfill God's will; and to *establish examples* of exactly how God's will can be done. Much has been done; much more is to be done. The recesses of the human soul and their ramifications in man's relationship to his fellow-man are more vast and difficult than the reaches of outer space. But God who set eternity in man's soul to prompt him to dare to try for conquest of the skies also created man with a heart hunger for his brother man. Out of that hunger the quest will continue until in Christ Jesus all men have become one family. To such an end the American churches are instruments of God.

## V. The Churches Speak

*By* Allen Lamar Cooper

Since the historic decision of the Supreme Court in May, 1954, many church bodies have issued official statements voicing their reaction to this decision and offering suggestions concerning courses of action which local churches are being challenged to take. It is the purpose of this article to bring together, without interpretation, statements made by three types of church bodies: ecumenical, denominational, and state councils of churches. Most of the statements included in this article have been received in response to an inquiry sent to many church headquarters. In addition to these, the writer is indebted to the *Christian Century* and to *The Church Woman* for statements included in their publications. Eleven denominational bodies indicated that they have not felt the need for making an official statement on race.

### *The Ecumenical Church Speaks*

"Racial and ethnic fears, hates, and prejudices are more than social problems with whose existence we must reckon; they are sins against God and His commandments that the Gospel alone can cure. . . . This is the calling of the Church with regard to race, to witness within itself to the Kingship of Christ and the unity of His people, in Him transcending all diversity. . . . The great majority of Christian churches affiliated with the World Council have declared that physical separation within the Church on grounds of race is a denial of spiritual unity, and of the brotherhood of man. . . . A great duty lies upon us all to reject utterly any claims of racialism or nationalism that are incompatible with our faith, to extend fellowship to those at whose hands we have suffered, and to forget the hurts of the past. Out of such love and generosity, new hope can be born. . . . The Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches declares its conviction that any form of segregation based on race, color or ethnic origin is contrary to the Gospel, and is incompatible with the Christian doctrine of man and with the nature of the Church of Christ. The Assembly urges the churches within its membership to renounce all forms of segregation or discrimination and to

[8]Ronnie Dugger, "Texas Christians Stem the Tide," *The Christian Century*, July 31, 1957.

work for their abolition within their own life and within society. In doing so the Assembly is painfully aware that, in the realities of the contemporary world, many churches find themselves confronted by historical, political, social, and economic circumstances which make the immediate achievement of this objective extremely difficult. But under God the fellowship of the ecumenical movement is such as to offer to these churches the strength and encouragement to help them, and individuals within them, to overcome these difficulties with the courage given by faith, and with the desire to testify ever more faithfully to our Master." *World Council of Churches*, 1954.

"The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in its organizational structure and operation renounces and earnestly recommends to its member churches that they renounce the pattern of segregation based on race, color, or national origin as unnecessary and undesirable and a violation of the Gospel of love and human brotherhood. While recognizing that historical and social factors make it more difficult for some churches than for others to realize the Christian ideal of non-segregation, the Council urges all of its constituent members to work steadily and progressively towards a non-segregated church as the goal which is set forth in the faith and practice of the early Christian community and inherent in the New Testament idea of the Church of Christ. As proof of our sincerity in this renunciation, the National Council of Churches will work for a non-segregated church and a non-segregated community." *National Council of the Churches of Christ in America*, June, 1952.

*The Denominational Churches Speak*

"Whereas (the Supreme Court) decision has completely changed the bi-racial pattern of education in some parts of our nation which for years set apart Negro Americans as inferior and denied them equal educational opportunity; and . . . . Whereas, we regard this decision as vindicating the time honored position of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in proclaiming the absolute equality of all men before God . . . . we commend the Supreme Court for this far-reaching decision and urge the support and cooperation of our entire constituency in its implementation." *African Methodist Episcopal Council*, June, 1954.

". . . (We recommend) to our far-flung constituency . . . . active cooperation with local s c h o o l boards in implementing the program of immediate desegregation and urging our pastors, presiding elders and people to contribute to the morale-building principles employed to create the climate of public opinion favorable to desegregation in every form of American life . . . . we urge our secondary schools and Junior Colleges to amend their charters and/or their rules and regulations, if necessary, so as to provide for integrated faculties and student bodies." *African Methodist Episcopal Zion Board of Christian Education*, August, 1954.

"Our convictions demand that we speak, because we believe that God has made all men in His image, and therefore all men have equal rights. Our history demands that we speak, for our missionary investment of prayer and money in behalf of minority groups in America is one of our major investments. Our fellowship demands that we speak, because millions of Negro Americans and other minority peoples are not only our brothers in Jesus Christ, but are also members of the same family of Christian faith in Baptist churches. . . . Because we accept these facts we dedicate ourselves to the following objectives: (1) that membership in each Baptist Church shall be open to all people of its community regardless of their race or national origin; (2) That each church shall choose its minister on the basis of character and ability without regard to racial background; (3)

That each Church shall work to assure equality for all people in education, employment, housing, and political activity; (4) That members of our churches shall base their fellowship with others on individual merit without regard to racial origins. . . . (6) That each Baptist organization, school, home, and hospital shall follow practices that are consistent with clear policies of racial nondiscrimination." *American Baptist Convention,* June, 1957.

"Wherever and whenever the churches help to foster race or class distinctions between people, and wherever and whenever they support attitudes of superiority or inferiority between persons, groups or classes, they violate God's patterns. . . . Christian churches unfailingly, therefore, must condemn segregation and stratification as the evil fruit of natural man's pride and his arrogant assumption of superiority over those who appear to be different from him." *American Lutheran Church,* 1954.

"Whereas, the decisions of the United States Supreme Court dealing with compulsory segregation of the races have removed the legal sanction of second-class citizenship in our land, and provided a mandate for all citizens to work for the elimination of segregation and the securing of their basic constitutional rights to all our citizens. . . . be it resolved; that the . . . American Unitarian Association favor every attempt to meet and search for areas of agreement and mutual understanding among men of all races and persuasions and will ourselves foster and join with all such attempts. . . .That we urge upon all governmental officials and agencies their duty to accord the full protection of the law to all citizens in the exercise of their rights, including the right to vote, and the other rights guaranteed by the constitution. . . ." *Amercian Unitarian Association,* May, 1956.

"We urge our members to use their influence in the securing of full rights of citizenship for all, and in discouraging any activities in their communities which would seek to circumvent orderly judicial procedure in the implementation of the Supreme Court decisions of segregation. . . . We recognize that the evils of racial discrimination are not restricted to any one section of the nation, and we encourage our people to oppose all forms of racial discrimination whether they be found in the North or in the South. . . . discrimination in housing, real estate transactions, and employment is just as much a violation of Christian principles as discrimination in places of public assembly, public transportation, or schools." *Augustana Lutheran Church,* 1956.

". . . discriminations due to color, nationality, or creed are out of keeping both with the teachings of the New Testament and with the stated position of the Church of the Brethren. We therefore recommend: . . . that all Brethren Churches move ahead courageously by ways most successful in their cultural surroundings to remove all discrimination within their own fellowship; that Brethren work in the ways most adapted to their local situation for the removal of discriminatory practices within the cities and communities where Brethren Churches are located; that in all projects where General Brotherhood funds are appropriated, special efforts be made to teach against and to remove all forms of discrimination as rapidly as possible." *Church of the Brethren,* June, 1953.

"We urge Christians to practice and seek to spread equality of opportunity for all people; equal pay for equal work; equal protection by law; equality of suffrage; equal recognition of persons as persons without respect to religion, class, or race." *Cumberland Presbyterian Church,* June 1955.

"We recommend that local churches, where segregation has prevailed, move towards ways in which they and all churches can open their membership to all persons

on a simple basis of faith and character, and that we call upon Congregational Christian colleges, agencies, associations, conferences and institutions to practice non-segregation and non-discrimination in enrollment, employment, church extension and church conservation, and organization." *Congregational Christian General Council,* June, 1954.

"We urge and encourage all ministers and churches of our communion to be willing to bear any cross of persecution or reprisal brought upon them by their fearless witness to the rights of all people, regardless of race or ethnic origin, to liberty, equality, justice and human dignity, and to the true nature of the Church and the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ without fear or favor. . . . that we discourage our churches in areas of racial change and transition from selling out and relocating —where the move has been based on the change in the racial or ethnic character of the population, and encourage our churches to remain on the field and bear fearless witness to the true nature of the church; that we, as a brotherhood, provide a counseling service and, if needed, financial support to churches confronted with a population change in racial or ethnic character, in order to help the church remain on the field and weather the transition period." *International Convention of Disciples of Christ,* 1957.

"We believe that God created one human family and that all men everywhere, whatever their color, culture, class or caste, are inseparably related and bound together as members of that one human family. . . . There are circumstances under which integration may be the only possible course to pursue; there are other circumstances under which, at least for the time being, integration is still impossible; and there are circumstances under which it may be wiser to substitute for integration the establishment of a separate mission congregation for the Colored." *Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference,* 1958.

"We must say plainly that to attempt to evade integration in the public schools by actions which would weaken or undermine the public schools is wrong. No doubt, integration in public schools will proceed at different rates. There are situations in which wisdom and discretion are needed as well as situations in which the complacent need to be stirred to effective and constructive action. The decision of the Supreme Court outlawing racial segregation in the schools provides the occasion for the members of Christian congregations to bear witness to the truth in love and to the love of truth; to support with their sympathy and prayers those who are devoted to constructive efforts towards a greater degree of justice; and to encourage consultation between white and colored persons in the local community in the interest of common understanding and planning." *Evangelical and Reformed General Synod,* 1956.

"The Church respects human personality inherent in the people of every race, and protests against social, economic, or political discrimination based merely on racial differences. We, therefore, urge our members to encourage inter-racial fellowship; to maintain friendly relations through the home, school, and church; to oppose all practices of racial segregation; to keep our churches open to men of all races; and to support legislation in harmony with these convictions." *Evangelical United Brethren,* 1954.

"We believe that a society motivated by religious and democratic ideals has no place for discriminations such as these. While we are encouraged by signs of a growing practice of integration and inclusiveness in many Friendly institutions, we must face the extent to which segregation still exists in others. If we associate ourselves in natural human relationships with people of all

groups, we must welcome them to our meetings and to our communities. We must demonstrate our willingness to work in non-segregated situations. We must seek to employ members of all groups on their merits. We must work for the establishing of fair employment practices as public policy. . . .Even as earlier Friends set themselves to eliminate slavery from their membership, we in our generation must set ourselves to overcome the evils of segregation, hoping to enter as they did upon a new and unguessed richness of human fellowship, new and untried deeps of the Divine resources and companionship." *Friends of Philadelphia,* 1949.

"Whereas, the Free Methodist Church of North America has declared that 'the glad tidings must be proclaimed to every individual of the human race—to savage and civilized, bond and free, black and white—', Be it therefore resolved that this body commend the Free Methodist laymen, pastors, superintendents, and general officers who by their efforts and influence have endeavored to maintain our original convictions by keeping the doors of our churches and general gatherings open to all people regardless of race, class, or color, and with special commendation to those pastors and laymen who have successfully integrated into their membership born-again Christians of various races and nationalities. Be it finally resolved that we urge Free Methodists across the nation to continue to witness to the Bible standard of brotherhood both in word and deed and to lend their support to other religious bodies and suitable secular organizations in an effort to combat racial discrimination." *General Conference of the Free Methodist Church,* 1955.

"True Christians must have no distinctions among themselves. . . . However, true Christians of both races know that the only real solution to the old world's many social problems and injustices will come not in man's way, but only when Jehovah God, through his Son Jesus Christ, abolishes all the fears, inequalities and injustices of Satan's old world and replaces them with the blessings of God's righteous new one. Thus, rather than embroiling themselves in political agitation on behalf of their own or some other race, or kicking against the established system, they put their efforts into the far more important work of preaching the good news of God's kingdom to all people—showing them the blessings that will come through God's direct intervention, but not in man's way. This is in harmony with the example set by the first-century Christians who . . . . were too busy with the more important spiritual matters to step into the field of social reform." *Jehovah's Witnesses,* April, 1956.

"There must be no place in The Methodist Church for racial discrimination or enforced segregation. Recognizing that we have not attained this goal . . . . we recommend that discrimination or segregation by any method or practice whether by conference structure or otherwise in The Methodist Church be abolished with reasonable speed . . . The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States relative to segregation make necessary far-reaching and often difficult community readjustments throughout the nation. We call upon our people to effect these adjustments in all good faith, with brotherliness and patience. In doing this all racial groups must be willing to admit their imperfections and seek to correct them . . . . In this spirit we recommend the following: that the institutions of the church, local churches, colleges, universities, theological schools . . . . hospitals, and homes carefully restudy their policies and practices as they relate to race, making certain that these policies and practices are Christian; that Methodists in their homes, in their work, in their churches and in their communities actively work to eliminate discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. . . . That our pastors, upon whom rests the

responsibility of receiving individuals into church membership, discharge that responsibility without regard to race, color, or national origin; that bishops, district superintendents, pastors, and lay leaders seek ways for the implementation of better fraternal relations between the Central Jurisdiction and other jurisdictions where they are adjacent . . . ." *The General Conference of the Methodist Church,* 1956.

". . . . The National Association of Evangelicals reaffirms its belief in the teachings of Jesus Christ, including His emphasis upon the inherent worth and intrinsic value of every man, regardless of race, class, creed, or color, and that we urge all our constituency to use every legitimate means to eliminate unfair discriminatory practices, and that, therefore, we deplore extremist tactics by any individual or organized groups." *National Association of Evangelicals,* April, 1956.

". . . . Enforced segregation of the races is discrimination which is out of harmony with Christian theology and ethics and the Church, in its relationship to cultural patterns, should lead rather than follow. (It is recommended that) the trustees of institutions of higher education belonging to the General Assembly adopt a policy of opening the doors of these institutions to all races; that the Synods consider earnestly the adoption of a similar recommendation to trustees of institutions under their control; . . . . that the sessions of local churches admit persons to membership and fellowship in the local church on the Scriptural basis of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ without reference to race; that in this time of crisis and concern, we commend to all individuals in our communion . . . . the earnest cultivation and practice of the Christian graces of forbearance, patience, humility and persistent good will." *Presbyterian Church U.S.,* 1954.

"The 168th General Assembly enjoins ministers and members of our churches to stop talking about having 'no problem' in situations where tension does not exist and the problem is therefore concealed; to stop being content with a mere confession of guilt apart from deeds of repentance; to stop pointing the finger of accusation at areas of high tension or conflict; to begin serious, prayerful study where there is no present tension; to bring about in small groups encounters and frank conversations with minority persons of comparable education and experience, and specialists in the field of human relations; to welcome people of all races in the life and work of their churches; to evangelize in the homes of nearby residents without regard to race in order to bring them into the fellowship of the church." *Presbyterian Church U.S.A.,* General Assembly, 1956.

"The 58th General Convention . . . . commends to all the clergy and people of this Church that they accept and support this ruling of the Supreme Court, and, that by opening channels of Christian conference and communication between the races concerned in each diocese and community, they anticipate constructively the local implementation of this ruling as the law of the land; . . . . that we make our own the statement of the Anglican Congress that 'in the work of the Church we should welcome people of any race at any service conducted by a priest or layman of any ethnic origin, and bring them into the full fellowship of the congregation and its organizations.' " *Protestant Episcopal General Convention,* 1955.

"We recognize the fact that this Supreme Court decision is in harmony with the constitutional guarantee of equal freedom to all citizens, and with the Christian principles of equal justice and love for all men. We urge our people and all Christians to conduct themselves in this period of adjustment in the spirit of Christ; we pray that God may guide us in our thinking and our attitudes to the end that we may help and not hinder the progress of justice and

brotherly love; (let us) exercise patience and good will in the discussions that must take place, and give a good testimoy to the meaning of Christian faith and discipleship. We express our belief in the public school system of our nation as one of the greatest factors in American history for the maintenance of democracy and our common culture, and we express the hope that in the working out of necessary adjustments, its place in our educational program shall not be impaired." *Southern Baptist Convention,* June, 1954.

"No distinction on account of nationality, race, or caste, is recognized by God. He is the Maker of all mankind. All men are of one family creation, and all are one through redemption. Christ came to demolish every wall of partition." *General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists,* 1958.

". . . . the United Presbyterian Church has always believed in the integration of the races; . . . . (God) is no respecter of persons; men are created equal and meant to live together in a love that means equality of opportunity and privilege. In the light of these principles we thank God that the laws of the land have made segregation illegal in education." *United Presbyterian Church of North America,* June, 1956.

*State Councils of Churches Speak*

"Be it resolved that . . . . the Florida Council of Churches go on record as: calling all the people represented by the member bodies of this Council . . . . to prayer and prayerful study of the problem that Christian principles and not worldly prejudices may prevail in the solution of this difficult social problem now confronting the people of the state of Florida." *Florida Council of Churches,* October, 1954.

"We (believe) that Christian people have an especial responsibility for the solution of our racial problems . . . . We do not believe that the South is more to blame for the difficulties which we face than are other areas of our nation . . . . We are also conscious that racial injustice and violence are not confined to our section . . . . We do believe that all Americans, whether black or white, have a right to the full privileges of first class citizenship. To suggest that a recognition of the rights of Negroes to the full privileges of American citizenship, and to such necessary contacts as might follow would inevitably result in intermarriage is to cast as serious and unjustified an aspersion upon the White race as upon the Negro race. Believing as we do in the desirability of preserving the integrity of both races through the free choice of both, we would emphasize the following principles which we hold to be of basic importance for our thought and conduct: freedom of speech must at all costs be preserved; as Americans and as Christians we have an obligation to obey the law; the public school system must not be destroyed; hatred and scorn for those of another race, or for those who hold a position different from our own, can never be justified; communication between responsible leaders of the races must be maintained; our difficulties cannot be solved in our own strength or in human wisdom." (The above statements are taken from the *Manifesto* drawn up by eighty Atlanta ministers, and adopted on November 20, 1957, as the official stand of the *Georgia Council of Churches.*)

"We believe that discrimination because of race, creed, or national origin is not only incompatible with the spirit of democracy and fair play but is incompatible with the spirit of Christianity . . . . We are aware that, in the realities of the contemporary situation churches find themselves confronted by historical, political, social, and economic circumstances which make the immediate achievement of this objective extremely difficult . . . . We call upon our churches, our agencies, and our institutions, to re-examine themselves in light of the implications of Christ's gospel and to

initiate and encourage voluntary, racially inclusive, community groups to plan for full compliance with the gospel of Christ, as well as definite techniques for implementation within their own bodies." *Kentucky Council of Churches,* April, 1955.

"The unanimous decision of the Supreme Court that Segregation in the public schools is unconstitutional gives a clear status in law to a fundamental Christian and American principle. To put the decision into effect will test the good will and discipline of people in many communities . . . . In the period of transition from one pattern to another, we know that the churches and individual Christians will continue to exert their influence and leadership." *The Council of Churches and Christian Education of Maryland-Delaware,* September, 1954.

". . . . we commend the 1957 General Court and the Governor for the passage of the law against discrimination in publicly assisted housing. We urge the Christians of the Commonwealth to welcome people of all races and creeds as their neighbors. We also call upon our churches to become a living witness of our Christian faith by seeking to evangelize and win to their fellowship all unchurched people of the community whatever their race may be . . . . we call upon employers to square their policies of employment and promotion with Christian principles. We particularly urge our churches to consider for the vacancies in their pulpits all qualified persons regardless of racial backgrounds." *Massachusetts Council of Churches,* November, 1957.

"Just as we have worked for equality of opportunity in education, employment, and resort accommodations, we also believe that all citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property." *Minnesota Council of Churches,* 1956.

"We believe that this decision is consistent with the spirit and teachings of Jesus Christ, and we further affirm that this decision is in keeping with what has been through many years the official position of the Christian church, as it has understood the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ . . . . We call upon the members of our state legislature to find ways of implementing in our state the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court. We ask that in every circumstance they exercise clear and calm judgment and Christian good will in all their attitudes and actions concerning this vital matter in accordance with the ideals of our Christian faith." *New Orleans Council of Churches,* July, 1954.

"Now that the Supreme Court has spoken . . . . we urge that the churches as represented in the council accept the decision of the court as the law of the land and endeavor as fully as possible, in the spirit of Christ, to realize an integrated public school system." *North Carolina Council of Churches,* January, 1956.

". . . . each church is encouraged to have an active organized Race Relations Committee which might function as follows: as a liaison between churches and other community agencies; to sensitize church leaders to the problems; to obtain and distribute literature; to stimulate interest in interracial programs; to prepare congregations for the presence and participation of those of other races in church and community affairs; to promote harmony in order to ease the transition to new patterns; . . . . to use all good methods to teach better personal relationships and show people how to deal with prejudice." *Oklahoma Council of Churches,* 1954.

"1. That we assert our conviction that racial discrimination is contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. 2. That we recommend to our constituent church bodies that they caution their members to think carefully before joining or giving endorsement to any type of councils, by whatever name, which

have as their purpose the circumventing of the Supreme Court decision on segregation in public education. 3. That they urge their members to oppose all legal subterfuges, such as interposition, nullification, secession, etc., which seek to evade compliance with the Supreme Court decision. 4. That they urge their members to practice Christian patience and forbearance and pray daily for God's guidance as we deal with this difficult problem in human relationships and move forward to a higher plane of Christian democracy." *Texas Council of Churches General Assembly*, 1956.

"We urge all Christians to move with Christian patience and hope upon a course of good faith and wisdom in order that they may not become the victims of despair." *Virginia Council of Churches*, January, 1956.

"The Church has long been working on the problem, realizing that it is in keeping with Christian convictions and democratic principles . . . . Therefore, we call upon Christians throughout West Virginia to face the implications of the integration problem with honesty and integrity." *West Virginia Council of Churches*, 1956.

## VI. Race and the World Mission of the Church

*By* Alfred W. Wasson

The expression "world mission of the church" is a timely and comprehensive term that has come into general use within the last two decades. It is still in the strength of early manhood, able to carry a large and growing conception of the scope of the task which Christ has committed to his servant, the Church. It is a commodious term. It brings together objectives and ideals and tasks of Christians working in different sectors of the kingdom or at different parts of the total task. It is flexible in that it leaves liberty to follow the leadership of the Spirit in changing times unfettered by outgrown priorities. And it provides opportunity to take on new tasks as new needs arise or as old needs are felt by an awakened conscience.

A part of the total mission very directly affected by the racial situation is the foreign missionary task. Since the organization in 1810 of the American Board, the first of a long line of missionary boards and societies, an increasing number of American Christians have been interested in Foreign Missions. How this movement is affected by the racial situation is for them a matter of real concern. Has the road toward the goal of foreign missions come to a dead end? Is further progress toward the evangelization of the world blocked by the present racial situation?

### *Christianity's Past Experience with Race*

Stated in this extreme form the question is easily answered. The past experience of Christianity with race provides adequate data for a negative answer. During its entire history Christianity has confronted racial and other lines that divide human groups from one another. It is an historic religion. It began at a definite time and place in history. It had only one beginning and that was in Palestine. It is monogenic. The Christianity found today in any part of the world started in Palestine, even though to reach its present position much of it has traveled by way of Europe or America.

It took root first in Jewish soil. Some of the early Christians had misgivings as to whether the precious seedling could grow in any other soil. They assumed that a Gentile would have to become a Jewish proselyte before he could be a Christian. They soon discovered their mistake, but again and again the successors of Peter and Paul have had to relearn the same lesson; namely, that

God shows no partiality and that no race has sole jurisdiction over the road that leads to Christ.

For more than nineteen centuries the Christian religion has been crossing racial and cultural lines. To be sure, the advance has not been at a uniform rate. There have been delays and setbacks. Racial and cultural differences have often been a formidable obstacle. Usually the barrier is a double wall built up on one side by the group Christianity is trying to enter and on the other by the group to which the missionary belongs. It was a double wall of this sort that Robert Morrison, the pioneer missionary to China, faced when he went to that country in 1807. On one side was the racial pride of the Chinese and their contempt for the westerner and his civilization; on the other, the greed of the white trader, his refusal to respect the laws of China (even the law forbidding the importation of opium), and the support he received from the superior guns of his country. For seven years this wall delayed the winning of the first convert.

In spite of apparent exceptions, the past experience of Christianity with race confirms our faith that no racial situation need be a permanent barrier to the entrance of Christianity, for the barriers are removable. Whatever in a racial situation interferes with the advance of the kingdom is a challenge to the more heroic practice of the Gospel.

### *The Racial Situation*

The conclusion drawn from history that the advance of Christianity need not be blocked by the racial situation may be accepted by the American Christian without removing his perplexity. A more relevant question for him is, how does the racial situation affect the opportunity of American Christians to participate in the world mission of the church? Does the racial situation within America and the attitude of other peoples toward America bar Americans from taking a worthwhile part in the world mission? To answer these questions it is helpful to look at the racial situation and at the experience of foreign missions.

The word race is loosely used. Scientists have tried to divide all mankind into a limited number of groups which are distinguishable from one another by observable traits. But no one has tried to enumerate the number of groups to which the term race is applied in popular usage. And there are more racial situations than there are races. In the United States, for example, the racial situation between Gentiles and Jews and between Negroes and whites varies from city to city and from state to state.

Conflicts between racial groups do not arise over the color of the hair, the shape of the nose, the cephalic index, or any other trait used by anthropologists in classifying races. As Ellsworth Faris said in *The Nature of Human Nature,* "Race prejudice is a phenomenon that is not essentially connected with race." In other words, the problems in racial situations are not due to factors that came to each group through biological heredity and which the groups are powerless to change. Racial conflicts, like other conflicts, can be resolved where there is sufficient good will and good judgment on all sides.

Within practically every country there are race relations that cause anxiety and create problems. The most far-reaching of racial situations is that between the white and colored races. It is not the most bitter. There is greater hostility between some of the colored races and between some subdivisions of the white race. But it is the one in which most of the foreign missionary work of the church is found and the one most directly affected by any discrimination against the Negro in America on the grounds of race.

### *Foreign Missions*

There is some confusion in the use of the terms "foreign mission" and "world mission." The foreign missionary enterprise was started by European and American Christians for the purpose of taking the Gospel to other lands. Since the missions were located in foreign lands it was natural and appropriate to call them "foreign missions." The work they started is still going on; the name has been outgrown. It is still frequently used, but the term "world mission" is now generally used to describe the enlarged movement. In this article foreign mission is used to refer to the movement up to the year 1938 and world mission to refer to the same movement as it has continued since that time. The year 1938 is selected as the dividing point because in that year the historic Madras meeting of the International Missionary Council was held, and the last comprehensive world-wide survey made under the auspices of the Council was published.

The first step in beginning foreign missions was the formation of missionary societies in Europe and America. From the age of Constantine the main carriers of the Christian religion to non-Christian peoples had been Christian rulers and monks and nuns of religious orders. Protestants frowned upon monastic orders; their rulers, even where there was a state church, had little or no interest in spreading the Gospel beyond their own territory. Missionary societies made it possible for Christians who desired to do so to combine their resources and send missionaries to non-Christian lands. The first missionary society in England was formed in 1792 by thirteen persons who under the leadership of William Carey met in a private home and organized the Baptist Missionary Society. The society enlisted other members and the next year sent Carey and a surgeon named John Thomas to India as their first missionaries. Within a few years several other societies were organized in England and in 1810 the first society was formed in the United States. In time, as missionary interest grew, denominations set up official boards to direct their overseas work.

The first converts were won and the first schools and hospitals were established by foreign missionaries. Whatever was done or decided with reference to church questions was by missionaries because they were the only Christians on the scene. As soon, however, as the first converts were won and instructed, their interest and labor supplemented that of the missionaries.

The comradeship between pioneer missionaries and early converts was intimate. They prayed together, read and translated the Bible together, and planned ways of serving and of presenting Christian truth to the people of the community. The converts helped the missionaries to understand the culture and to live in unfamiliar surroundings; the missionaries helped the converts to understand and adjust their way of living to the new religion and to stand fast against temptations and persecution. Soon the differences in appearance due to race which seemed so conspicuous at first were forgotten. The racial pride that lurked in the mind of the missionary was worn down as he saw the converts and also the 'heathen' doing things which he was unable to do. Missionary and convert, as they kneeled before the Lord, felt closer to one another than either did to members of his own race who knew Him not.

### *Numerical Progress*

By 1900 the total working staff on all the mission fields consisted of 14,374 missionaries and a native staff of five times that number. The communicant Church members numbered 1,214,797. In 1938 there were 27,577 missionaries, a native staff more than seven times that size, a communicant Church membership of over six million, and a constituency of 13,000,000

among fully 1,377,000,000 non-Christians. The amount of money supplied by the missionary societies and boards for the support of missionaries and for work budgets on the field was $30,938,450. The amount almost matched the income on the fields which was $28,738,790. The total amount spent by all Protestant churches of the world on foreign missions was much less than the five billion dollars spent by the United States on the Korean war in one year.

### *Change in Position of Christianity*

By this year (1938) the missionary movement had radically changed the position of Christianity in the world. From a religion largely confined to one race in one part of the world it had moved into all races in all parts of the world. This influx from other races and religions was far more than a change of religious labels such as took place when tribes of western and northern Europe followed their leaders en masse into the Christian Church. For a large proportion of those who joined the Church through the efforts of foreign missions that step meant the enthronement of Christ in the heart to an extent that worked significant changes in conduct and customs.

### *Rise of National Leaders*

A significant feature of foreign missions was the caliber of the leaders who arose on the field. In each of the larger mission fields there were leaders who filled with competence positions of responsibility: pastors of influential self-supporting churches, presidents of institutions, bishops of the Church. Some were national figures known and respected outside the Christian community. Through regional meetings held under the auspices of the Church or the Y.M. or Y.W.C.A leaders of different mission fields became acquainted and formed friendships across racial and national lines. In meetings of the International Missionary Council leaders of the younger churches met with leaders from the West in an atmosphere of mutual esteem and respect. Many traveled extensively in the West and addressed quadrennial meetings of the Student Volunteer Movement and other important groups. Traveling back and forth across the world they were like shuttles weaving the tapestry of brotherhood. The Christians on the mission fields together with the Christians of Europe and America had now become "a world-wide fellowship interpenetrating the nations, bridging the gulfs between them and supplying the promise of a check to their rivalries."

The way the foreign missionary movement formed within itself a fellowship that transcended racial divisions was dramatically illustrated in a meeting of the International Missionary Council in a Christian College near Madras, India, in December, 1938, on the eve of World War II. Among the 471 persons present from 69 countries were delegates from Japan and China whose nations were already at war and delegates from Germany and Britain and other countries where tension was high. With great seriousness and sincerity the delegates declared,

> Our nations are at war with one another; but we know ourselves brethren in the community of Christ's Church. Our peoples increase in suspicion and fear of one another; but we are learning to trust each other more deeply through common devotion to the one Lord of us all.

### *Secrets of Success*

At different times in the course of its history various factors affected the growth of foreign missions, some favorably, some adversely. Let us look at some that have been present from the beginning and that have a bearing on the prospect of maintaining and enlarging the Christian world community. One is the motive or driving power. From the first the master motive has been religious; it arose from the missionary's relation to Christ and his conception of what that relation required of him. It was not

rooted in the condition or nature of the people to whom he was sent. Strictly speaking, it was not love of people whom they had never seen that impelled volunteers to offer themselves for foreign missions; it was the love of Christ that constrained them.

This motive gave the missionary love and respect for all peoples regardless of their race or culture since all were persons with whom their Lord identified himself. It has never been limited to foreign missions or to Western Christians. It is the same motive that takes a Batak Christian to Sarawak, a Filipino Christian to Thailand or an American to India in 1958. The driving power in foreign missions is available for world missions.

Another secret of the success of foreign missions is found in its unselfish character. The thought of the foreign missionary was centered upon serving the people to whom he was sent. He sought nothing for himself or for his nation or for the society that supported him. In later years, after the interdependence of peoples had increased, it became evident that the missionaries had really been serving their own countries also by laying the foundations for peace and world-wide cooperation. But this consideration of mutual security and mutual interest which today is rightly strong in world missions was not consciously present in the early period of foreign missions.

Another element of strength was the limitation which the religion the missionaries sought to propagate placed upon the methods they could use. It was a type of religion that could not be forced upon anyone. It could not be spread by coercion or command or bribery or clever propaganda. Any effort to operate through pressures from positions of superior strength was self-defeating.

The nature of the enterprise in which the missionary was engaged gave him a distinct advantage over representatives of government or trade in gaining an understanding of people of another race and in winning their friendship and confidence. It also put a firm foundation under the emerging world-wide Christian community and bound its members together with bonds that are stronger and more enduring than those of mutual interest alone.

### *The Great Handicap*

We turn now from elements of strength to look at the great handicap under which foreign missions labored from the first and which now hinders the world mission. The persistent handicap is not race; in itself race is not a barrier. The greatest obstacle to the spread of the Christian religion is the un-Christian conduct of individual Christians, Christian groups, and other groups of which Christians form a conspicuous part. It must have been this fact the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council had in mind when it called to the churches "that they strive to deliver the name of Christ and of Christianity from complicity in any evil or injustice."

This persistent handicap that has so delayed the progress of missions is no worse today than it was at the beginning of foreign missions. When the first societies were formed, British and Americans were engaged in a lucrative slave trade. Fifty years later the British were involved in the opium war in China and human slavery was still practiced in America. Yet, in spite of this terrific handicap, Christianity had won a toehold in China and Africa.

Non-Christians naturally judge Christianity by what they hear and see of the conduct of people in countries where Christianity is the prevailing religion. Christians, however, reverse the process. For example, an Indian Christian with a mature faith no longer judges Christianity by what Americans do; he judges America by the standards of the Christian religion. Still he is hindered in his efforts to commend his

faith to his neighbors and even to his own children by reports of evil and repulsive conduct by Americans. It is a deep tragedy that the report of an outrage committed upon the person of a Negro in America and tolerated by the Christian people of the community in which it occurs may come between a Christian father and the winning of his own son to the Christian faith.

Happily the persistent handicap that has dogged the course of Christian missions is only one side of the coin. In the history of the dealings of the American nation and people with other countries there are many chapters that bring a glow to the Christian heart and smooth the way for American Christians to participate in the world mission of the Church. The anti-American sentiment that has become vocal during the last decade cannot be disregarded. But if carefully pondered even these criticisms, both fair and unfair, may guide us into fields of undreamed of opportunity.

In many important matters the relations between peoples are determined by government and governmental agencies. Working through these channels Christians can do much to promote good relations between peoples. Within the world mission of the Church a work is being done that changes race relations in a more vital manner. Both avenues of service were never more open to American Christians than they are today. In the twenty years since the foreign missionary enterprise came to maturity and was given a new name, the church it planted has continued to grow in size and strength. During World War II the younger churches in wide areas demonstrated their ability to survive even when cut off from communication with the parent churches. The Church in China has surmounted the obstacles created by communist control of the country. The Asian revolution has awakened in the hearts of the people high hopes and it has made imperative changes in organization and methods of missionary service. But it has not closed the door. The difficulties the nations are encountering in realizing their hopes help to keep the door open. High among the difficulties are the prejudices and antagonisms between racial and other groups within the nation. And that is a difficulty with which the Christian movement is best prepared to cope.

# BOOK REVIEWS

FRED D. GEALY, *Editor*

## AN EPITAPH FOR DIXIE

*By Harry S. Ashmore. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.,* 1958. 189 *pp.* $3.50.

This book brings immediately to mind W. J. Cash's volume of some fifteen years ago, *The Mind of the South.* What that distinguished analysis did for an earlier day, Ashmore's much shorter study brings up to the present. Out of all the spate of writing now being turned out on the South and its problems, this is the best job I know.

Its strength lies in many secondary virtues—grasp of facts, clear and readable style, poised and good-humored temper, and brevity of argument. But its greatest strength rests in its combination of two qualities, one or the other of which is often lacking in current analyses of the Southern situation. These two are an informed sense of urgency in respect to the present day and a sure sense of perspective with which to view it. The expression of urgency is often made at the expense of perspective, and vice versa—but not here. Ashmore has accomplished successfully the difficult task of combining the two, and the result is a balance in presentation that is truly constructive.

The Old South is dead, like it or no—that is the explanation for his arresting title. What will the New South be? What *must* it be, if the South is to be true to its authentic, valuable past and released from its stultifying myths of thought and practice? The racial problem comes in for its full share of attention, of course, but Ashmore is concerned with more than race. For example, his chapter on Texas is a wise and honest analysis of what makes us tick in the Lone Star State, and whether and how we are likely to join the nation. Confessing his indebtedness to his own Southern past and deeply concerned over the ordeal of the present, he yet centers his attention on the future, and on the chance that he believes the South has for real greatness in meeting and slowly solving its problems. Here is no wistful desire for a day long gone, nor any cynical pessimism about the present. Here is, strangely, a chastened optimism—and to think that such an analysis came out of Little Rock, from the Editor of the *Arkansas Gazette,* in light of all the vilification he has received at the hand of Faubus' followers, is to heighten one's appreciation of his accomplishment.

Most people will be interested primarily in his treatment of the racial problem. Two sentences summarize his point of view, and incidentally, underscore the need for ministers especially to assume some leadership: "The angy cries of defiance sounding across the nation do not echo a gallant past, only a contemporary temper tantrum." (p. 188) "When the South, after its promising start toward a resolution of the race problem after the Civil War, relapsed into dead-end racism it was not because evil men charted that course, but because good men grew weary and allowed uninformed popular opinion to have its way." (p. 185) The burden of his whole thesis is, Good men must not grow weary! If you are looking for a good dose of backbone, factual and inspiring, to help you keep at the difficult task of seeking to improve human relations in our land and time, read Ashmore!

Merrimon Cuninggim

## THE KINGDOM BEYOND CASTE

*By Liston Pope. New York: Friendship Press,* 1957. 172 *pp. Cloth,* $2.50, *paper,* $1.25.

Although designed as a text for missionary study courses, this book deserves a much

wider public. The small compass of the book is absolutely no index of the excellent coverage of a vast amount of material. This is the best missionary study text that this reviewer has ever seen.

Liston Pope, born and reared in the midst of southern folkways, is well qualified to help us see our racial dilemmas. The book is filled with references to recent and current events which depict all levels of racial tension in the entire nation. This presentation of the full scope of our racial problem allows no one of us to feel satisfied—the examples of tension are too close to our daily lives.

The chapter on race gives a very fine brief account of the rise of concern about race. The part of de Gobineau, H. S. Chamberlain, and Adolf Hitler in raising the specter of race is history that should be familiar to every minister. The biological and anthropological materials are completely accurate even when reduced to broad generalizations for popular usage.

The haphazard character of prejudice and caste are remarked with sufficient detail to convince. The recent Supreme Court decisions are placed in proper perspective as part of the changing patterns of American culture. One wishes here that a little more attention had been given to Myrdal's "rank order of discrimination" and to other decisions of the Supreme Court. Although one must be selective in such a short book, neither Myrdal nor the Supreme Court should be slighted.

The more positive content of integration is preferred to the negative implications of desegregation. The case for integration is forcefully presented, both theoretically and strategically. The undemocratic character of segregation is strongly stressed. The strategy for integration is drawn from the work of a group of social scientists led by Robin Williams. The conclusion of these scholars, drawn from the evidence of studies made in 20 American communities, is reported: "The amount of prejudice a person has may have little to do with his behavior if he is placed in a non-segregated situation." The author is fully aware of the measures taken by southern states to render ineffective the ruling of the Supreme Court, but he is sure that a use of the strategy outlined in this book will hasten compliance with the ruling of the courts.

The segregated character of most Protestant churches is the central issue dealt with in the discussion of the churches. The rapidly changing situation has made some of the data in this chapter dated. The number of integrated congregations has been growing steadily. Also, at least two of the denominations listed as Negro now have white members.

The Christian Church still has a long way to travel before it exemplifies its own ideals in the field of race relations. Books such as this one will serve handsomely in keeping us aware of the cleavage that exists between stated ideals and practices. This book should be read by every Christian in the United States. Its fine combination of challenge, information, and strategy is unique.

Serious attempts have been made to prevent the use of this book in W.S.C.S. study courses. These attacks are not leveled at either the factual accuracy or the Christian impact of the book. Rather, by innuendo an attempt is made to relate Liston Pope to subversive figures. These insinuations are without foundation and do not even deserve mention except that they may prevent some unwary person from reading the book. The whole attack is an attempt by segregationists to discredit the distinguished Dean of Yale University Divinity School. This book, however, will obviously add greatly to the reputation that Dr. Pope already holds of being a courageous prophet of social justice.

Douglas Jackson

## CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY

*By George F. Thomas. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,* 1955. 539 *pp.* $5.75.

Seldom does a single volume attempt to deal with both Christian ethics and moral philosophy. George F. Thomas, former student and teacher at Southern Methodist University, sets himself the formidable task

of uniting ethics and religion. He deplores the gulf which has so often existed between the Hellenic and Hebraic elements in the ethical tradition of the Western Church. After presenting his interpretation of Christian ethics, Dr. Thomas analyzes the relation of Christian ethics and moral philosophy.

Unfortunately the union between Christian ethics and moral philosophy never quite is complete. Although due attention is given to the current theological revival, moral philosophy seems primary. Insufficient attention is given to the Christian doctrines other than the doctrine of man. Christian ethics must be rooted in the doctrines of God, creation and redemption.

In the section on Christian ethics and society the author treats several areas of practical concern for social ethics. Issues include sex and marriage, love and justice, politics, democracy, economics, race, and war.

In his chapter on love and justice the author is most successful in relating ethics and Christianity. He declares: "If love does not change the structures of justice, it will be socially ineffective. . . . Social justice, though an indispensable, can never be a complete and adequate expression of love. . . . Love must seek social justice for *all* but must also go beyond this to seek the welfare of *each* as an individual."

In the chapter on race, segregation is condemned for its violation of Christianity. Through segregation the members of the majority escape knowledge of the evil consequences of their unchristian discriminatory practices. The Negro may in truth prefer his segregated church since "it is more natural to worship with people who set up no barriers against one than with those who exclude one from most of their lives."

This book is well organized and contains a wealth of material. This reviewer has used it as a sourcebook for church school lessons. The preacher will find it valuable too. In it he will not find ready-made sermons, but the stimuli for many sermons dealing with the problems of our day.

Douglas Jackson

## CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD

*By Arnold Toynbee. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957. xii + 116 pp. $2.75.*

## THE COMING WORLD CIVILIZATION

*By William Ernest Hocking. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1956. xiv + 210 pp. $3.75.*

How should the Christian community regard and relate to the other religions of the world? This is an old and mooted issue. Now, with the rise of nationalism and the general resurgence of traditional faiths in much of the non-Western world, this problem has acquired a new urgency. Here in these books two noted scholars, one an historian and the other a philosopher—neither a stranger to controversy—face the issue anew in an endeavor to relieve the tensions that have resulted from the sometimes grinding encounters of disparate religions.

Toynbee's and Hocking's approaches to this matter are not identical, but they are sufficiently similar to permit a joint summary. Each one recognizes that, at least superficially and at times profoundly, the world is being unified. Toynbee calls the unifying agent "Western Civilization;" Hocking terms it "modernity." In the transitions and fusions that go on apace, cultural particularity is threatened but not necessarily doomed. Religions, also, are still alive, and their ministrations are still needed. In the day that is emerging, both authors envisage a condition of continued coexistence of religions, and both are hopeful that in that day the right of religious particularism may be maintained in freedom from hostility.

Both Toynbee and Hocking feel that Christianity can have a definitive role to play in determining the future of religion for the entire world. Truly a universal faith, Christianity has much to offer—much perhaps of which its own devotees are not sufficiently aware. In consideration of this likelihood, each author has set forth in some detail his analysis of the current challenge and relevance of the Gospel. Still, each one

also has his word of warning concerning the exclusivism with which the Christian message is usually preached. Toynbee calls for the abolition of "the traditional Christian belief that Christianity is unique." This, he says, is necessary "if we are to purge Christianity of the exclusive-mindedness and intolerance that follows from a belief in Christianity's uniqueness." Hocking, still calling for a "reconception" of religion and religions, favors "putting away an inherently noble but limiting type of Only-Way Christianity whose impulse to spread the faith has been less the joy of good tidings than the rescue motive."

For these and for their other prior efforts, both Toynbee and Hocking often are described as advocates of religious syncretism. Some even have supposed that to label them in this fashion is sufficient to dispose of what they have to say. Actually both authors have specifically denied the adequacy of the label, but this fact also is, in itself, of little importance to the task of evaluating the significance of their efforts. It is the opinion of this reviewer, who does not wish to take his stand unqualifiedly with either spokesman, that the voices of both ought to be widely heard throughout the Christian community. Their words are at times theologically disturbing, perhaps even theologically naive or unsound; but the problem with which they wrestle is not solely a theological problem. The opinions of historians, philosophers and of many others must be aired with those of the theologians if we are to find a way of creative witness and accepting love among the other religions of the world.

H. Neill McFarland

## PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

*By David Elton Trueblood. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957. x + 324 pp. $3.75.*

In the preface to this book, Professor Trueblood tells us that "for better or for worse, this is the time to try to make my major contribution." He clarifies this statement by briefly recounting his interesting career as student, teacher, scholar, and writer and especially by explaining how in more recent years he has once again returned to a "more strictly academic approach to the philosophy of religion."—What we have in this book, then, is a self-conscious and deliberate effort to do a "comprehensive" job in the general area of the philosophical analysis of religious experience. That this effort is genuinely successful, at least as a "comprehensive" statement of Trueblood's own characteristic approach to the problems of this area, will be clear to all of the students of his work. This volume is indeed a kind of summary and definitive statement of the general position which is either expressed or implied in all of his other books. And perhaps the most succinct way to express at least one considered estimate of its value is simply to say that it makes unambiguously clear both the particular strengths and weaknesses of this kind of a position.

That the strengths are very real can hardly be questioned. One is struck time and again by the way in which Trueblood creatively exploits some of the cumulative insights of more recent serious inquiry in his discipline in order to shed a new and penetrating light on old and vexing problems. Thus, to take but one of several possible examples, his discussion of the relationship between philosophy and religion is one of the most generally satisfying of any of which this reviewer is aware. Following up some hints in William Temple's and Samuel Alexander's Gifford Lectures, he makes a distinction between "enjoyment" and "contemplation" (or, in William James' terminology, "knowledge of" and "knowledge about") and draws the conclusion that "religion is essentially a matter of 'enjoyment' [i.e., direct experience or encounter], while philosophy is essentially a matter of 'contemplation' [i.e., thought or reflection about such immediate experience]." This same basic thought is also expressed epigrammatically in the statement that whereas "the essence of philosophy is to *think*, the essence of religion is to *dedicate*." One ventures to suspect that if this distinction were really taken seriously and worked out in

all of its many implications, our possibilities for dealing with the general problem of faith and understanding in a really adequate way would be immeasurably enhanced.

However, it is precisely in this connection that one of the characteristic weaknesses of Trueblood's type of approach also becomes apparent. For hardly has he made the distinction to which we have just referred than he assents to the erroneous judgment of C. S. Lewis that these two activities of "enjoyment" and "contemplation" are not only "radically different," but also "temporally incompatible" (i.e., one cannot simultaneously be a religious man and a philosopher, but must constantly "alternate" between the two vocations). If this is really so, however, then, contrary to Trueblood's own assertion, "to say that philosophy and religion are not the same" *is* "to be under the necessity of choosing between them." So far from being unique, however, this particular difficulty is fairly typical of the characteristic inadequacy of Trueblood's essentially eclectic kind of approach. While his work unquestionably reflects and appropriates some of the really significant scholarship in his field, it also frequently suffers from the lack of integrity that is the curse of any electicism.

One other characteristic weakness of the book also deserves a special word of comment. Although Trueblood explicitly indicates that he writes from the standpoint of a "Protestant Christian" and also makes clear his manifold indebtedness to the "neo-Protestant" movement of the twentieth century, his discussion of particular problems seldom seems really to benefit from the new theological knowledge of which this movement has been the bearer. Thus, in his discussion of "prayer," "miracle," and "providence," he affirms that "advanced religion [by which he means presumably Christian faith] requires supernaturalism" and then goes on to argue that such "supernaturalism" does not necessarily conflict with the world-picture of modern science. Aside from the fact that this argument is just about as unconvincing as arguments of this kind generally are, what is disturbing about such a position is that it shows no evidence whatsoever of having come to terms with much recent work in biblical and systematic theology. Instead of recognizing that the authentic biblical and Reformation understanding of "prayer," "miracle," and "providence" has nothing whatsoever to do with the validity or invalidity of a "supernatural" (or "mythological") world-picture, Trueblood assumes the ironic burden of laboring at an implausible argument for an essentially un-Christian (or better, perhaps, not essentially Christian) understanding of the world.

These critical remarks are not intended to discourage a careful reading of the book, which certainly deserves our every consideration, but are offered simply by way of evaluating its final effectiveness. It is a responsible treatment of the problem with which it deals, and, while one may hope that its general position will eventually be overcome, it is frequently instructive and may certainly be read with real profit.

Schubert M. Ogden

## RELIGION IN MODERN LIFE

*By George G. Hackman, et al. New York: The Macmillan Co.,* 1957. *viii* + 480 *pp.*

Written primarily as a textbook, this volume is intended to provide a comprehensive introduction to the whole field of religious science in its bearing on an understanding of the nature and role of religion in modern Western culture. The authors explicitly point out that their purpose is not to write either an introductory philosophy of religion, or a text in comparative religions, but rather to deal with the more general question of the meaning and function of religion as such from the standpoint of our contemporary individual and collective life. While one may readily agree that this is a worthy aim and that the "general reader"—whether the college undergraduate or the inquiring layman—does indeed need the kind of guidance that such a book might well provide, he may nevertheless entertain very real doubts as to the overall success of this particular volume. At any rate, the judgment of this reviewer is

that it falls far short of really treating in an adequate way the complex and important question of "religion in modern life."

This is not to say, of course, that the book is entirely without merit or that it does not occasionally speak to some of the dimensions of this question in ways that are suggestive and worthy of serious consideration. It is to say, however, that again and again it not only fails to make use of important resources for dealing with its problems which have long since been made available to us, but also persists in presenting perspectives whose untenability has been conclusively demonstrated. Thus, for instance, in the brief discussion of the life and teaching of Jesus, it is evidently taken for granted against an impressive body of contrary opinion that the reported conversations of Jesus with the woman taken in adultery and the woman of Samaria were actual historical occurrences. Also, the astonishingly implausible suggestion is offered that Jesus may have chosen twelve disciples because he recognized "what is now known to be a sound psychological principle, that for purposes of education and social action this is an almost ideal number with which to work." In a similar vein, the epoch-making work of Albert Schweitzer and Johannes Weiss is all but entirely neglected and we are presented with an "uneschatological" Jesus of whom the New Testament history and witness know nothing at all. One could have hoped that we were safely beyond the time when statements such as these would appear in a book of this type: "[For Jesus,] the kingdom of God begun by the Messiah will come slowly, imperceptibly, certainly, and only by gaining the voluntary allegiance of the hearts and minds of individuals." "The kingdom is 'within you,' that is, it is in the hearts of men." "It was the personality of Jesus that attracted and impressed the disciples." "Some of Jesus' teachings concerning the kingdom . . . suggest that the expanding of the kingdom in this world will take much time."

In other respects also, the book's general inadequacy is just as impressively disclosed. For example, the discussion of the traditional arguments for the existence of God is singularly unperceptive and, in fact, shows a remarkable ignorance of some of the most significant of the classical discussions of this entire question.

In a word, and without presuming to take from the book any of the very real values which it undoubtedly possesses, it is simply impossible to recommend it to the readers of this journal.

Schubert M. Ogden

## SPIRITUAL RENEWAL THROUGH PERSONAL GROUPS

*Edited by John L. Casteel. New York: Association Press, 1957. 220 pp. $3.50.*

How will church historians in subsequent centuries evaluate the various religious movements of the twentieth century? Will it be the mass evangelism of Billy Graham that attracts their attention? Will it be the increase in church membership in the United States? Or the failure of the church to deal constructively with the problem of race? Will it be the Ecumenical Movement that will be in the forefront of their analyses? Certainly there are many strands of Christian history in the making, for good and for ill, and among these many facets the small group movement may not be sufficiently wide-spread to attract the attention of these future historians. I am convinced that whether it achieves wide recognition or not, however, it is one of those quiet and not easily defined movements in the church through which a fresh infusion of grace is coming and which, if it becomes sufficiently wide-spread, may become one of God's means of reviving the local church in a way in which the Ecumenical Movement may be His means of reviving Protestantism in general.

We have needed a description of these groups in America, and John Casteel's book provides a good beginning. Generally European groups such as Iona are better known than what is happening in American local churches. It is with sincere gratitude, then, that we turn to Dr. Casteel's book which brings together nine accounts of the origin

and nature of small fellowship groups in the United States and Canada. The stories are told by persons in the midst of the movement, with an introduction and final summary by the editor.

Unlike the European groups, most of which draw persons from various localities to a central meeting place for a brief meeting, those described in this book are an integral part of a local church with one exception, and even here a wider movement eventuated in the forming of local church groups. Most of the groups begin either with a concern to study or to pray together. All manifest a common discovery—the deepening of fellowship (*koinonia* is the New Testament word), which concerns both human and divine association. Most recognize the danger of exclusiveness, and soon begin to reach out beyond their own members through both individual and group service in church and community.

A few show, perhaps unconsciously, the danger of "piosity," but most have sought to avoid mere verbalization about the faith. A recurring theme is that you cannot organize small, concerned groups from above, that they must originate with a concern to study, pray, serve on the part of potential members. No account suggests that such groups ought to take the place of other educational and organizations groupings. These are extras, consisting usually of a minority of members in any local church who meet together with a common concern to learn more of their faith, to have their own religious lives deepened, and to find a new channel for their Christian concern.

Dr. Casteel's attempt at a definition, while by his own admission inadequate, is illuminating: ". . . a personal group is a small number of persons, meeting face to face regularly for the purposes of the study of the Bible and of the Christian faith; for prayer; for the exchange of experiences, needs, and insights; and for taking thought as to how they can best fulfill their calling as Christians to love and serve God and other people."

If you are concerned with the spiritual searching of those persons in your church who find conventional church groups inadequate, this book can be a stimulus for seeking new channels of renewal. It can be put in the hands of laymen. It will not provide a blueprint for action, but it could be the suggestions which would lead to the deeper searching which the church needs and which is already felt by at least a few laymen in almost any local church.

Howard Grimes

## PROPHETIC PREACHING: A NEW APPROACH

*By Otto J. Baab. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. 159 pp. $2.50.*

This book does for preachers what it advocates that preachers do for their people. It witnesses with power to the Redeeming Word of God. In a day when the prevailing emphases threaten to make "organization men" of preachers, this testimony from Dr. Baab concerning prophetic preaching comes as a welcome corrective. It is not a corrective, however, in the sense of emphasizing the other extreme. Rather, it is a corrective in its persuasive presentation of the Redeeming Word as the very identifying heart of anything rightly called "Christian community."

It would be expected that Dr. Baab would deal competently with the message of the prophets, and this he does. The notable features of the book, though, are (1) the treatment of the prophetic world-view, theology and anthropology in direct relationship to their contemporary and to our contemporary alternatives; (2) the interpretation of the prophetic message in integral relationship to the New Testament *kerygma;* and (3) the analysis of the eschatalogical aspect of prophetic preaching, along with a telling argument for this element as an essential aspect of genuine Biblical preaching.

The thesis of *Prophetic Preaching* is developed under the headings of prophetic passion, problem, purpose, power, perspective and promise. There is an index of Scripture references as well as an index of subjects.

This book should be of substantial value to every preacher on the firing line. It also will serve helpfully in seminary courses on Biblical preaching. And what other kind should there be?

Joseph D. Quillian, Jr.

## THE RURAL CHURCH MOVEMENT

*By Mark Rich. Columbia, Missouri: Juniper Knoll Press, 1957. vi + 251 pp. $3.50.*

Mark Rich, Professor of Rural Church at Missouri School of Religion, is one of the most qualified men in the field to write the first comprehensive history of the rural church movement. Rich was a successful pastor, and for fifteen years director of town and country work for the Northern Baptist Convention before becoming professor of rural church at the new seminary in connection with the Missouri School of Religion. Rich received the Ph.D. in Rural Sociology from Cornell University in 1938.

The rural church movement is quite new, taking form in progressive programs, as far as the church is concerned, since 1910. Rich has traced the movement from its roots which date back into the colonial times. He follows the framework of George Frederick Wells in the four major periods of Rural Church development: Period of Solidarity, about 1620 to 1775; Period of Division, about 1775 to 1780; Period of Decay and Concern, 1870 to 1909; and Period of Cooperation and Integration, 1910 —.

In a careful, scholarly fashion Rich has documented movements, activities, persons, places, and organizations having influence in the development of the rural church movement. He holds there have been two underlying objectives behind the movement: evangelism and social action, with the latter being the dominant motive.

> The land frontier was closing in and new social frontiers were opening. Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbusch and Shaler Matthews, heralds of a social gospel, were disturbing the nineteenth century pietism and extreme individualism in religion. *McClure's* magazine had employed a battery of "muck-rakers": Ida M. Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, and Ray Stannard Baker, able writers who exposed the social evils of Standard Oil Company, the "shame of the cities," and sundry other corruptions.

Rich feels the rural church movement got underway in 1910 and gives six reasons for this date: 1. For the first time national agencies were established to carry on the program of rural church work. 2. A professional leadership arose to fulfill the aims and hopes of the movement. 3. The rural church interest became national in scope. 4. The rural church interest became positive in that it began to turn from a *problem-conscious stage* to a *solution-seeking stage.* 5. The forces operating in the rural church field began to be integrated for a united impact. 6. These new interests and programs were sharply focused about the concept of the church as a community-serving institution.

In an effort to define the rural church movement, Rich points to the phases of concern for social reform, the development of a philosophy of rural life, and the use of knowledge gained through sociology. The lingo of the rural sociologist has become a part of the rural church movement. The concern for the whole community on the part of the church has emerged as one of the predominate phases. In the midst of these concerns, early Protestant rural church leaders were possessed with individualism and pietism. Here much was made of personal sin, or repentance and salvation. The person was viewed as isolated from his environment. "Christians were urged to remove themselves from the affairs of the world. 'Shall We Gather at the River' was sung with vigor while 'Where Cross the Crowded Ways of Life' remained unknown."

> Eventually, the social interest of the movement reconciled itself to the current individualism by bringing about a synthesis of the two points of view. Wherever the rural church movement spreads one hears men talk about the community, about man's obligation for natural resources, the need for cooperation with constructive forces, and of the unity of all life under God.
>
> The rural church movement is an invisible and powerful force. There is no membership. Anyone in comradeship with others in the enterprise

is a part of it. Yet, it has no headquarters. It elects no officers. It has been sponsored by committees and departments of denominational boards and chiefly through the Department of Town and Country Church of the National Council of Churches and through many other agencies. It focuses in every local community where men have caught the spirit.

This book would be good reading for any minister or layman whether rural or urban. The town and country movement has become one of the major forces within the church, Protestant or Catholic. Dr. Rich has done a superb work in bringing together in a readable and scholarly fashion the history of one of the great movements within Christendom.

Marvin T. Judy

## TOKUGAWA RELIGION

### The Values of Pre-Industrial Japan

*By Robert N. Bellah. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957. xii + 249 pp.* $5.00.

One of the most remarkable episodes in modern history is Japan's emergence as an industrial nation. Until recently those of us in the West, who have been curious enough to ask how it happened, have been content with the explanation that the Japanese are the ablest borrowers in the history of the world. Latterly, however, there has been a growing disposition to question the adequacy of this analysis and to seek an explanation more deeply rooted in the very structure of Japanese culture and society. The present book is the result of such an inquiry, focused particularly upon the nature and functional role of religion in the *Tokugawa* period (1600-1868 A. D.), The immediate pre-industrial era in the history of Japan.

This study was inspired by the work of Max Weber in analyzing the relation of religion, especially Protestantism, to the development of modern Western society. Reflecting on this work *vis-á-vis* the Japanese data, the author, who is both a sociologist and a specialist in Far Eastern languages, began to ask, "was there a functional analogue to the Protestant ethic in Japanese religion?" His conclusion is that there was. He demonstrates convincingly that "a strong polity and dominant political values in Japan were distinctly favorable to the rise of industrial society," and that "religion played an important role in the process of political and economic rationalization."

This book is a sociological essay of considerable significance. As such it is occasionally somewhat technical for the non-specialist reader; still, for the most part it may be read with profit by anyone who has more than a casual interest in Japan or the social scientific study of religion. For example, in the development of his thesis the author included a large body of factual data and a number of translations of source material which are not available in other books in English. Also, the book is an able demonstration of the manner in which religion and other aspects of culture interpenetrate and of the manner in which religion may function in relation to the central values of a society. This is a valuable lesson for all professional religious workers to learn.

H. Neill McFarland

## PRINCIPLES OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

*By Raymond Abba. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957. 187 pp. with index and bibliography.* $2.75.

## CHRISTIAN WORSHIP, ITS HISTORY AND MEANING

*By Horton Davies. New York: Abingdon Press, 1957. 125 pp. and bibliography.* $2.00.

American Methodism, with its sister churches, is showing a new interest in worship. Given our theological foundations and our historical heritage in liturgy and ritual, there is good reason to believe that a new religious awakening is possible for us. These two books are a part of a growing number of studies into various aspects of this field.

Both of these books are written by Congregational ministers and teachers. Both men are British, though Dr. Davies is now teaching at Princeton. These studies "speak

to our condition," however, for American Methodism in particular has a great common heritage with the Reform movement. It is only in minor matters that a Methodist minister would differ with these men. For example, we hardly deplore so vigorously the abandonment of the common cup, as Abba does. But both books are written in a wide enough context to include a fine understanding and appreciation of our worship—particularly our hymnody.

The Davies book gives a brief history of our worship from the Temple and Synagogue through the early church down through the major traditions of the Church. The last half of the book deals with the content of worship and its central place in the Christian life.

Dr. Abba is not so much concerned with the history of worship, though he places much of his study on a sound historical basis. His chapters on the ministry of the Word, public prayer, church praise and the Sacraments should be required reading for any man entering the ministry. To one who is in the ministry now it preaches the kind of sermon he will want to hear in order to put fresh meaning into his calling as a servant of the Word.

If there is an adult class looking for a good book to study, give them Davies. If there is an adult class looking for a book to give their pastor, give him Abba. He will want to add this to Donald Baillie's *The Theology of the Sacraments* and his other books on worship.

H. Grady Hardin

## THE CHURCH SCHOOL

*By Paul H. Vieth. Philadelphia: Christian Education Press, 1957. 279 pp. $3.50.*

"Where can I find the answer to my problem?" is a question often heard in the church school. It is asked by experienced workers and beginning workers. It is asked in large churches and middle sized churches and small churches. In *The Church School* Dr. Vieth answers this question.

Many have been waiting for this book. It combines theory and practice in a way that has seldom been done. It is a reference book of specific answers to specific questions which confront every worker in the local church program of Christian Education: What is the Church? What is Christian Education? How does the Church teach?

These short statements of Dr. Vieth's philosophy of Christian Education are followed by the discussion of over two hundred problems relating to the church school. Here are a few: "What considerations should determine the policy with respect to awards?" "Should boys and girls be separated in church school classes?" "How large should church school classes be?" "Why do pupils misbehave?" How may good order be secured and maintained?" "What should the church school budget include?" "What may be done by teachers to get pupils to accept and do home work?" "How can a one-room church meet the problem of rooms and equipment?" "How may the problem of tardiness be met?" "Should there be assembly for worship for the whole school?" "Is a chapel for children recommended?"

One cannot think of a question that is not discussed here. Further, these problems are listed under topics in the last chapter of the book so they may be found easily.

Dr. Vieth recognizes that every problem not only has many sides but also that there are no sure fire answers to any problem. He urges that the reader use the book to help him think through whatever problem is his and then, guided by sound principles and a spirit of patience and love, use his own creative efforts to solve those problems. But Dr. Vieth does not leave one here. He presents the many sides of the problems but has the courage to give his own view. This is not easy, but his experiences give authority to the answers.

*The Church School* is a valuable book. New workers will find that it gives them a wonderful place to begin their reading, and experienced workers will find it a stimulating discussion.

C. Wayne Banks